

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Complete Situation in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 21, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I made yesterday in an address to the Alexandria Kiwanis Club, in Alexandria, Va., in relation to the serious and complicated situation in the East.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE ALEXANDRIA KIWANIS CLUB, GEORGE MASON HOTEL, THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1955

SENATOR WILEY SAYS ASIA SITUATION SERIOUS, COMPLEX—URGES PATIENCE, RESTRAINT

The diplomatic situation which has arisen in the Straits of Formosa is both serious and complex.

This morning, I participated in a meeting at the White House with Democratic and Republican leaders which explored various problems in that connection.

I do not propose at the present time to comment in detail on this subject, but I do want to say that the administration is working hard to protect our own national interest and the cause of freedom, peace, and justice in Asia. Let's give the President and the Secretary of State a chance to work this problem out—in close consultation with the Congress.

Let's think, before any of us, inside the Congress or outside, rushes into print with off-the-cuff solutions to an exceedingly difficult situation.

I should like now to present a few general observations with regard to ways and means by which we may help assure a just and lasting peace in Asia, and for that matter, elsewhere in the world:

1. We can do so only by maintaining the strong western alliance, a dynamic unity

among the free nations, including our proven friends in Asia.

This requires careful and continuous consultation among all of them. It requires careful consideration of the viewpoint of each.

We must not ignore the views of others and proceed impulsively and emotionally like a bull in a china shop. We must weigh the interrelated military, economic, diplomatic, psychological factors, including basically United States strategic considerations in the Far East.

2. The second basic principle is that we must and will remain loyal to our allies. I refer, in particular, to the Republic of China. The government of Chiang Kai-shek has been our proven friend. We will, therefore, remain true to our commitments. We will not abandon the Nationalist government.

We definitely do not believe that the people of China should be represented in the United Nations by the Red government at Peiping which has violated practically every international law.

3. A third principle is that we must try to win to our cause the great neutral, uncommitted bloc of Asia.

I do not believe that there is any good reason why there should be a lasting or growing barrier between ourselves and the Governments say, of India, Ceylon, or Burma.

On the contrary, we share the same common aspiration for the sovereignty of peoples for a better way of life for them. We have the same belief in the spiritual worth of the human being.

On the other hand, Red China shares none of these concepts.

We must make sure, that we do not, by arbitrary, impulsive action push the neutral countries into Red China's orbit. This could have come about, or still could, if the United States were to go halfcocked and to try all by ourselves a military blockade of Red China at this time. Some of the gravest questions of international law would arise in the event such a unilateral blockade were to be attempted.

I previously have stated on several occasions my vigorous opposition to such a blockade at the present time.

I have stated that a blockade might result in the immediate death of our own 11 imprisoned airmen. It might cause a wide-open split with our allies. It might overcommit

our present naval resources. It might cause the bitterest of differences with the neutral countries. But, worst of all, it might precipitate us into a war with Red China, which is probably something the Kremlin would dearly like.

4. We must continue to work through the U. N., both for the release of our imprisoned airmen and for the furtherance of peace, stability, and freedom in the Far East.

I believe that it is unfair and unwise to characterize the mission of the United Nations Secretary-General to Peking as a failure. On the contrary, I believe that it contributed to progress toward the goal of peace.

We must remember that diplomatic negotiation, particularly with the cagey Communist adversary, often takes a long, long time. We cannot expect miracles overnight. An impulsive blockade could bring chaos overnight, but diplomacy cannot bring order and justice overnight.

5. The next basic principle is that we must contribute further to the inner security and strength of the free nations in Asia; for example, among such splendid friends as the Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan.

We must help enable them to assure security inside their own borders and at their outer borders. This means prompt ratification of SEATO—prompt ratification which must and will come.

At the same time, we must remember that these various countries require greatly expanded programs of technical assistance if they are to assure an ever-higher standard of living for their people.

Guns alone will not save free Asia. In a war of ideas, a war of hungry stomachs, right ideas and full stomachs count far more than weapons.

There must be guns for defense, but there must be ideas for the mind; there must be food, shelter; honest, efficient government; decent sanitation; opportunity for a higher standard of living as a whole.

I conclude with this thought:

Your President—a great President—is acting with care, with discretion, with judgment. He is consulting carefully on a bipartisan basis with the Congress.

Let's give him our faith and confidence. Let's give him the benefit of any doubt; he is entitled to our admiration and esteem. His record of statesmanship, and that of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, proves that we are in good, capable hands. Let's work with them as a team.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in changing and troubled days we pray for quiet hearts and conceptions big enough and spirits strong enough to match the awesome time in which we live and serve. We confess the things in our own dear land of liberty which weaken and betray the faith we profess. We acknowledge the selfishness which dominates groups caring only for their own interests; the partisanship which sees clearly the next election while ignoring the next generation; the narrow nationalism which is oblivious to the fact that exploitation and injustice anywhere poison the arte-

rial blood of the race; the excesses which are gnawing at the very vitals of our national life. O, America, America, God mend thine every flaw and fit thee to be the channel of His redeeming grace for all the earth.

Create in us clean hearts and right spirits as we face foes which have not Thee in awe, fanatical foes to whom human life is nothing because their gaze is no higher than the earth; whose pledged word is worthless because expediency is their only god; who, for their own ends, callously traffic in normal human affections and family ties. To protect this earth which could be so fair, our God, bless America as she throws her might across the path of so godless a pestilence. May our strength, moral and material, be a factor through Thy will in bringing to pass a just peace in our time, O Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 21, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes, in accordance with the usual practice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 76)

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in view of the importance of the message the President has sent to the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be postponed, and that priority be given to the reading of the President's message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President's message being a privileged matter, it may be laid before the Senate at any time, and the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before the message is read, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McNamara
Allott	Frear	Millikin
Anderson	Fulbright	Morse
Barkley	George	Murray
Barrett	Green	Neely
Beall	Hayden	Neuberger
Bender	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bible	Hill	Payne
Bricker	Holland	Potter
Bridges	Hruska	Purtell
Bush	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler	Ives	Russell
Byrd	Jackson	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kilgore	Smathers
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Langer	Sparkman
Curtis	Lehman	Stennis
Daniel	Long	Thurmond
Dirksen	Magnuson	Thye
Douglas	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Mansfield	Welker
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ervin	McClellan	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from South

Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The message from the President of the United States will now be read.

The message was read by the legislative clerk, and referred jointly to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The most important objective of our Nation's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable peace. In the western Pacific, a situation is developing in the Formosa Straits, that seriously imperils the peace and our security.

Since the end of Japanese hostilities in 1945, Formosa and the Pescadores have been in the friendly hands of our loyal ally, the Republic of China. We have recognized that it was important that these islands should remain in friendly hands. In unfriendly hands, Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance of moral, economic, and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes, for the United States and for other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security structure in that ocean. In addition, this breach would interrupt north-south communications between other important elements of that barrier, and damage the economic life of countries friendly to us.

The United States and the friendly Government of the Republic of China, and indeed all the free nations, have a common interest that Formosa and the Pescadores should not fall into the control of aggressive Communist forces.

Influenced by such considerations, our Government was prompt, when the Communists committed armed aggression in Korea in June 1950, to direct our 7th Fleet to defend Formosa from possible invasion from the Communist mainland.

These considerations are still valid. The 7th Fleet continues under Presidential directive to carry out that defensive mission. We also provide military and economic support to the Chinese Nationalist Government and we cooperate in every proper and feasible way with that Government in order to promote its security and stability. All of these military and related activities will be continued.

In addition, there was signed last December a mutual defense treaty between this Government and the Republic of China covering Formosa and the neighboring Pescadores. It is a treaty of purely defensive character. That treaty is now before the Senate of the United States.

Meanwhile Communist China has pursued a series of provocative political and military actions, establishing a pattern of aggressive purpose. That purpose, they proclaim, is the conquest of Formosa.

In September 1954 the Chinese Communists opened up heavy artillery fire

upon Quemoy Island, one of the natural approaches to Formosa, which had for several years been under the uncontested control of the Republic of China. Then came air attacks of mounting intensity against other free China islands, notably those in the vicinity of the Tachen group to the north of Formosa. One small island—Ichiang—was seized last week by air and amphibious operations after a gallant few fought bravely for days against overwhelming odds. There have been recent heavy air attacks and artillery fire against the main Tachen Islands themselves.

The Chinese Communists themselves assert that these attacks are a prelude to the conquest of Formosa. For example, after the fall of Ichiang, the Peiping radio said that it showed a "determined will to fight for the liberation of Taiwan [Formosa]. Our people will use all their strength to fulfill that task."

Clearly, this existing and developing situation poses a serious danger to the security of our country and of the entire Pacific area and indeed to the peace of the world. We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

Meanwhile, the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without awaiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now, by specific resolution, in measures designed to improve the prospects for peace. These measures would contemplate the use of the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores.

The actions that the United States must be ready to undertake are of various kinds. For example, we must be ready to assist the Republic of China to redeploy and consolidate its forces if it should so desire. Some of these forces are scattered throughout the smaller offshore islands as a result of historical rather than military reasons directly related to defending Formosa. Because of the air situation in the area, withdrawals for the purpose of redeployment of Chinese Nationalist forces would be impractical without assistance of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Moreover, we must be alert to any concentration or employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action.

I do not suggest that the United States enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty now awaiting ratification. But unhappily, the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

However, a suitable congressional resolution would clearly and publicly establish the authority of the President as Commander in Chief to employ the Armed Forces of this Nation promptly and effectively for the purposes indicated if in his judgment it became necessary. It would make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress and our people. Thus it will reduce the possibility that the Chinese Communists, misjudging our firm purpose and national unity, might be disposed to challenge the position of the United States, and precipitate a major crisis which even they would neither anticipate nor desire.

In the interest of peace, therefore, the United States must remove any doubt regarding our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa, and to engage in whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose.

To make this plain requires not only Presidential action but also congressional action. In a situation such as now confronts us, and under modern conditions of warfare, it would not be prudent to await the emergency before coming to the Congress. Then it might be too late. Already the warning signals are flying.

I believe that the threatening aspects of the present situation, if resolutely faced, may be temporary in character. Consequently, I recommend that the resolution expire as soon as the President is able to report to the Congress that the peace and security of the area are reasonably assured by international conditions, resulting from United Nations action or otherwise.

Again I say that we would welcome action by the United Nations which might, in fact, bring an end to the active hostilities in the area. This critical situation has been created by the choice of the Chinese Communists, not by us. Their offensive military intent has been flaunted to the whole world by words and by deeds. Just as they created the situation, so they can end it if they so choose.

What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy. Consequently, my recommendations do not call for an increase in the Armed Forces of the United States or any acceleration in military procurement or levels of defense production. If any unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, I will communicate with the Congress. I hope, however, that the effect of an appropriate congressional resolution will be to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict.

One final point. The action I request is, of course, no substitute for the treaty with the Republic of China which we have signed and which I have trans-

mitted to the Senate. Indeed, present circumstances make it more than ever important that this basic agreement should be promptly brought into force, as a solemn evidence of our determination to stand fast in the agreed treaty area and to thwart all attacks directed against it. If delay should make us appear indecisive in this basic respect, the pressures and dangers would surely mount.

Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination. In all that we do we shall remain faithful to our obligations as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

For the reasons outlined in this message, I respectfully request that the Congress take appropriate action to carry out the recommendations contained herein.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

January 24, 1955.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES TO PROTECT SECURITY OF FORMOSA—JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and myself, I introduce a joint resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area, introduced by Mr. GEORGE for himself and other Senators, was received, read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas the primary purpose of the United States, in its relations with all other nations, is to develop and sustain a just and enduring peace for all; and

Whereas certain territories in the west Pacific under the jurisdiction of the Republic of China are now under armed attack, and threats and declarations have been and are being made by the Chinese Communists that such armed attack is in aid of and in preparation for armed attack on Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas such armed attack if continued would gravely endanger the peace and security of the west Pacific area and particularly of Formosa and the Pescadores; and

Whereas the secure possession by friendly governments of the western Pacific island chain, of which Formosa is a part, is essential to the vital interests of the United States and all friendly nations in or bordering upon the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas the President of the United States on January 6, 1955, submitted to the Senate

for its advice and consent to ratification a mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of China, which recognizes that an armed attack in the west Pacific area directed against territories therein described in the region of Formosa and the Pescadores, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties to the treaty: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be and he hereby is authorized to employ the armed forces of the United States as he deems necessary for the specific purpose of securing and protecting Formosa and the Pescadores against armed attack, this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands and the taking of such other measures as he judges to be required or appropriate in assuring the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions, created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, and shall so report to the Congress.

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without such action being established as a precedent, the message received today from the President of the United States on the Nation's foreign policy, and the joint resolution which I have introduced today on behalf of myself and other Senators, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services for joint consideration and study, including the holding of hearings if deemed advisable; and that those committees, acting through the chairman of one of such committees, shall, at the earliest practicable time, by bill or otherwise, submit their recommendations to the Senate.

MR. PRESIDENT. I point out that a similar resolution was introduced on July 28, 1949, when unanimous consent was given and an order was entered providing for joint consideration of the resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. I am now making a similar request.

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. GEORGE. I yield.

MR. KNOWLAND. I am glad to join with the distinguished Senator from Georgia in making this request for a unanimous-consent agreement. I believe there have been a number of occasions upon which measures have been referred for joint consideration to the two committees mentioned, which have primary responsibility in this field. I think it would be entirely fitting and proper for those two committees jointly to consider a matter of this importance.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

MR. GEORGE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], which is at present occupying the old Supreme Court room on this floor of the Capitol, will undertake to procure the consent of his committee that the hearings to which I have referred may be held in the old Supreme Court room. Inasmuch as there

is to be a joint hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, it is necessary to provide a somewhat larger room than the regular committee room of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I give notice that if consent is given by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the use of the room, the hearings will begin this afternoon at 2:45.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that, should the Senate remain in session later than 2:45 p. m. today, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered?

Morning business is now in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, 36 reports relating to the overobligations of appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROFESSIONAL AND SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on professional and scientific positions in the Department of Defense, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of that System dated June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND AD- MINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES FOR ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for plant and equipment, including acquisition or condemnation of real property or facilities,

and plant or facility acquisitions, construction, or expansion, for the atomic energy program (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, RELATING TO DEBT CLAIMS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to an amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in such manner as to enable the domestic sugar industry of the United States to have a fair and equitable share in the Nation's growth; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WELKER, on January 21, 1955, p. 530, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Whereas the modern Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs National Park, Ark., was constructed at the cost of millions of dollars to all of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas during World War II it was expanded to include as its annex the great Eastman Hotel in Hot Springs; and

"Whereas this hospital is probably better located and situated to better serve as a hospital service center for our Army and Navy in time of atomic warfare than any other Government hospital in the United States; and

"Whereas in this hospital the patient members of our Armed Forces have the advantage of treatment with thermal hot waters, the benefits of which are unexcelled by any other similar treatment in the world; and

"Whereas the closing of this hospital by the Defense Department would be the zenith of extravagance and waste on the part of the Government and would be a calamity to the great national health resort of Hot Springs National Park, Ark.: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of Arkansas, That the Secretary of Defense be and is hereby respectfully requested and implored to rescind his order that such hospital be closed; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, to Vice President Nixon, to Speaker Sam Rayburn, and to each Member of the Arkansas delegation in the United States Congress.

"Q. BYRUM HURST.

"I, Jim Snoddy, secretary of the senate, do hereby certify that this is a true copy of senate joint resolution No. 2 as adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Sixtieth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas.

"JIM SNODDY,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Dr. Harold S. Jenneman, of Stanley, Wis., relating to the treaty-making power (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the American Dental Association, Chicago, Ill., signed by Harold Hillenbrand, secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that association, relating to support of the program of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of James McElwain, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of H. Joseph Mahoney, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to the treaty-making power (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to give its favorable consideration to legislation providing for an increase of cotton acreage to 19,500,000 acres

"Whereas the State of Mississippi is primarily dependent upon the health of its agricultural economy for the prosperity of its citizens and for making its contribution to the Nation's welfare; and

"Whereas the 1955 cotton crop, bulwark of Mississippi agriculture, has been seriously curtailed by a drastic reduction in acreage; and

"Whereas there are many small farmers in this State, a large number of whom have been dealt a mortal blow by the cotton acreage cut, and there now being an immediate economic emergency forced upon them by such reduction in cotton acreage; and

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States seeking to increase the cotton acreage allotment to 19,500,000 acres, which increase could do much toward alleviating hardship among cotton farmers, and particularly among those with small cotton acreage allotments; and

"Whereas it is the view of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi that this matter is of vital and pressing concern to the people of this State and to the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to give its most earnest and favorable consideration to the legislation now pending therein providing for a cotton acreage increase to 19,500,000 acres; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to members, both Senate and House, of the Mississippi delegation in Congress, and that a copy of this resolution be released to the press.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 12, 1955.

"WALTER SILLERS,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate January 17, 1955.

"CARROLL GARTIN,

"President of the Senate."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

Three resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation increasing the personal income tax exemptions

"Whereas it is estimated that approximately 80 percent of Rhode Island's industrial workers are engaged in either directly producing goods for the consumer market, or producing materials or parts for consumer goods; and

"Whereas Rhode Island's goods are sold in a national market, and therefore the prosperity of Rhode Island business and industry and high levels of earnings and employment depend on a sustained and rising level of consumer purchasing power throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas extensive unemployment has resulted from the fact that the Nation's productive capacity exceeds present levels of consumption; and

"Whereas it is essential to a more prosperous Rhode Island and a more prosperous Nation that national purchasing power be increased; and

"Whereas such an increase in purchasing power would be most effective and beneficial to the lower income groups who must spend the highest proportion of their income: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the personal income-tax exemptions; and be it further

Resolved, That attention of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States is respectfully called to these facts and that each is requested to use his best efforts in this behalf; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the respective presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, duly certified copies of this resolution."

"Resolution urging Congress to enact legislation to incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibilities in financing the employment security program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States

"Whereas, Rhode Island has few natural resources and is dependent on light manufacturing industries; and

"Whereas the economy of Rhode Island and that of other industrialized States depends largely upon a demand for our manufactured products which is far beyond a State's border to contain and far beyond a State's power to control; and

"Whereas these and most causes of unemployment are national in scope; and

"Whereas the effects of unemployment fall unevenly upon the highly industrialized States, of which Rhode Island is one; and

"Whereas this results in a severe drain on the Rhode Island employment security fund, placing this State in an unfavorable competitive position with other States not so severely affected: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations hereby urges the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, legislation which would incorporate the principle of reinsurance as a means of enabling the Federal Government to assume its responsibility in financing in part the employment security program and thereby equalizing the tax burden among the States; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, earnestly requesting the latter to use their efforts to be certain that legislation is enacted which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

"Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports

"Whereas textile, jewelry, and rubber goods manufacturing are three of Rhode Island's

major industries employing over 54 percent of Rhode Island's manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas manufacturing is the foundation of the Rhode Island economy whereby over one-half of the entire State's population is directly or indirectly dependent upon such industries; and

"Whereas in all of these industries labor and labor costs are vital factors representing about 60 percent of the value of the manufactured product; and

"Whereas such products can be and are manufactured today in many parts of the world, often with the aid of the latest types of American equipment; and

"Whereas the consequent threat of price competition from low-wage countries abroad is very real; and

"Whereas recent studies by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate the large wage differentials which place American manufacturers at a decided competitive disadvantage; and

"Whereas the Rhode Island textile industry, including lace goods, represents about 30 percent of all manufacturing employment and a total investment of \$300 million; and

"Whereas the jewelry industry employs about 19 percent of Rhode Island manufacturing workers; and

"Whereas the manufacture of rubber products represents a substantial portion of industry in this State; and

"Whereas this tremendous percentage of Rhode Island industrial workers would be forced into the ranks of the unemployed upon the closing of the mills and factories of this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States insist on increasing and maintaining proper tariffs on the imports of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the United States enter into no agreements and make no concessions to any foreign nation which would affect adversely the manufacture and sale of textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and more particularly the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives take every legislative precaution in enacting proper legislation to insure the creation and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Tariff Commission of the United States, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting that each use his best efforts to bring about the enactment and maintenance of proper tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports, to the end that the manufacture and sale of such goods in the United States are not jeopardized."

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution urging the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to reappraise Manpower Policy No. 4 to the end that Rhode Island may receive its fair share of defense contracts, so-called

"Whereas there has been a sharp reduction of Federal defense contracts, so-

called, in Rhode Island over the past 2 years; and

"Whereas such reduction can be considered directly responsible for a decline in Rhode Island manufacturing employment of over 11,000 workers which represent 40 percent of Rhode Island's current unemployment in manufacturing; and

"Whereas it is evident that Federal Manpower Policy No. 4 aimed at channeling defense contracts into labor surplus areas has had little effect on Rhode Island in the past year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, if defense contracts are to be used successfully to combat unemployment in distressed areas, the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island urges the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to reappraise Federal Manpower Policy No. 4 and to overhaul and better coordinate the general procurement policy of the Federal Government to the end that Rhode Island may receive its fair share of defense contracts, so-called; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Defense of the United States, earnestly requesting that each use his efforts to see that proper action is taken which would carry out the purposes of this resolution."

DEEPENING OF GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS — RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over Wisconsin I have received welcome resolutions from various civic groups urging early action to deepen the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes.

This project is the subject of a bill which I have already introduced, (S. 171) to authorize the modification of the existing projects for the Great Lakes connecting channels above Lake Erie, for this purpose.

I present two such representative resolutions, which I heartily endorse. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas the United States Army Corps of Engineers has filed its report on the cost of the proposed deepening and improving of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, with particular reference to the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, the St. Marys River and some shoal spots in the Straits of Mackinac; and

"Whereas the completion of said channel deepening and improvement project will permit large ships to enter the Great Lakes ports upon the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway when operating at maximum draft; and

"Whereas said channel deepening and improvement project will be beneficial to the city of Racine and to all of the other Great Lakes port cities, as well as the neighboring communities: Be it

Resolved, That the mayor and the Common Council of the City of Racine do hereby urge Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY and Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH to support any legislation, the purpose of which is to institute and complete

the above referred to channel deepening and improving projects; be it further

"Resolved, That the city clerk be and hereby is authorized and directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to the above referred to congressional representatives forthwith."

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

County of Racine, ss:

I, Frank J. Becker, city clerk of the city of Racine, Racine County, Wis., do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Common Council of the City of Racine, Wis., at a meeting held January 18, 1955.

Dated this 20th day of January 1955.

FRANK J. BECKER,
City Clerk.

"Whereas the benefits to our country of the long-awaited St. Lawrence Seaway will be fully realized only if the connecting channels of the Great Lakes are deepened so as to permit deep-draft vessels to reach all of the lake ports in the Midwest; and

"Whereas it is expected that legislation will shortly be presented to the Congress authorizing the deepening of these channels and appropriating the funds determined to be necessary by the Corps of Engineers: Be it

"Resolved by the Council of the City of Kenosha, That this council favors the passage of such legislation to the end that the great seaway project may most fully serve its intended purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our congressional Representatives.

"Dated this 17th day of January 1955.

"R. MERRILL RHEEY,
"President of Council."

I, J. R. Sawicki, city clerk, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution No. 5484 passed by the Council of the City of Kenosha, Wis., on the 17th day of January 1955.

J. R. SAWICKI, City Clerk.

ANTIMONOPOLY INVESTIGATION— RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present a resolution which I have received from C. F. Baldwin, manager of the Richland Cooperative Electric Association, of Richland Center, Wis. This resolution urges the allocation of sufficient funds to continue the investigation of monopoly by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee.

I believe that this investigation should indeed be carried on, and should have sufficient appropriations to enable it to do its job in a fair, effective, thorough way.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Rules Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHLAND COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC
ASSOCIATION,

Richland Center, Wis., January 21, 1955.
Senator ALEXANDER P. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The following resolution was adopted by the board of directors at their meeting of January 17, 1955:

"Whereas the Senate Judiciary Committee has been conducting a limited investigation of monopolies and restricted trade programs aimed at farm rural electrification programs; and

"Whereas insufficient funds have been appropriated for such investigations during the last session of Congress: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we urge Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin member of the Judiciary Committee, and other Members of the United States Senate to vote sufficient funds to complete the investigations of monopoly which have been started by the Judiciary Subcommittee."

It has been the opinion of this cooperative that Senator LANGER has been doing an excellent job with the limited resources he has had to work with. However, we believe that he could do a more thorough job if he had adequate funds to work with, and that his findings would prevent some repetition of economic catastrophes our country has experienced in the past. Is this in agreement with your opinion?

Respectfully yours,

C. F. BALDWIN, Manager.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJ- ECT—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the San Juan County Reclamation Association of Farmington, N. Mex., and the chamber of commerce of that fine community, have requested that I present to the Senate resolutions adopted by them endorsing the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and specifically the Navaho Indian project. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas legislation is now before the Congress of the United States to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

Whereas included in said legislation is the Navaho project in New Mexico which will utilize San Juan River waters, mainly to irrigate and rehabilitate a large section of land on the Navaho Indian Reservation; and

Whereas such rehabilitation, under the Navaho Indian project, will eventually be of great assistance to the Navaho Tribe in their struggle for survival, which assistance has heretofore been denied the Navaho Indians through the Nation's failure to comply with the Treaty of 1868; and

Whereas the citizens of San Juan Basin of New Mexico are fully cognizant of the plight of this minority group and urge full support be given to that end: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Farmington Chamber of Commerce of Farmington, N. Mex., expressing the wishes of the people of Farmington, N. Mex., enthusiastically endorses and fully supports congressional action to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and specifically the Navaho project.

FARMINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
FARMINGTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By ERNEST H. BRUSS, President.

A. J. ZIMMERMAN, Secretary.

Whereas legislation is now before the Congress of the United States to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and

Whereas included in said legislation is the Navaho project in New Mexico which will utilize San Juan River waters; and

Whereas the Navaho project is mainly a Navaho Indian project which will ultimately

result in great assistance to the tribe in solving a most serious economic problem, aside from rectifying some of this Nation's failures in compliance with the treaty of 1868; and

Whereas it is the desire and wish of all citizens of the San Juan Basin area of New Mexico that full support be expended toward the end of seeking congressional authorization of the Navaho project: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the San Juan Reclamation Association of Farmington, N. Mex., expressing the wishes of the people of San Juan Basin in New Mexico, enthusiastically endorses and fully supports congressional action to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and specifically the Navaho project.

SAN JUAN RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION,

By Ed H. FOSTER, President.

Attest:

A. J. ZIMMERMAN, Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 663. A bill for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzonis); and

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Mecys Jau-niskis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 665. A bill to revise section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 666. A bill to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 667. A bill to exempt meetings of associations of professional hairdressers or cosmetologists from certain provisions of the acts of June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 611), and July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622), as amended; and

S. 668. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947 as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THYE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 669. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DANIEL:

S. 670. A bill to increase the penalties prescribed for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the antitrust provisions of the Wilson Tariff Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Charalambos Anastasios Papaspiratos; and

S. 672. A bill for the relief of Richard T. Harvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 673. A bill to provide for a Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital of

1,000 beds at Gainesville, Fla.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 674. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union-shop agreements; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romalda Stase Plachowa Manley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 676. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Borromeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 677. A bill for the relief of Susanne Feller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 679. A bill for the relief of Shalom Fred Ron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 680. A bill to provide for granting to the several States the minerals and mineral rights subject to disposition under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 on the condition that the income from such minerals and mineral rights be used for certain public purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 681. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion;

S. 682. A bill to accelerate consideration by the courts of criminal proceedings involving treason, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and subversive activities, and to increase to 15 years the statute of limitations applicable to such offenses;

S. 683. A bill for the relief of Ashley G. Ogden; and

S. 684. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Oscar Ems de Huy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 685. A bill for the relief of Yen-Yu Huang and his minor daughters, Li-An Huang (also known as Lillian Huang and Lillian Kan), and Chi-An Huang (also known as Jean Huang and Jean Kan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. HENNING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. GORE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MONROE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. McNAMARA, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 686. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 687. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to protect the timber and other surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 688. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the Classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to tech-

nical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 689. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 690. A bill to amend section 35 of the Oil Lands Leasing Act of 1920, relating to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 691. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Planor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. DANIEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 692. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. POTTER (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THYE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 693. A bill for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 694. A bill for the relief of Jacob Fraim Zubli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 695. A bill for the relief of Cirilo Jose;

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Melton T. Tapawan;

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Mateo Parilla;

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Alvaro A. Jose;

S. 699. A bill for the relief of Alfredo A. Sevilla; and

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Mariano J. Uy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

(See the remarks of Mr. GEORGE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INCREASED PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SHERMAN ANTITRUST AND WILSON TARIFF ACTS

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would increase from \$5,000 to \$50,000 the maximum penalty for violation of the laws prohibiting trusts and monopolies.

This proposal is in line with the recommendation made by the President in his Economic Report, page 50, which reads as follows:

The Government has a responsibility to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly, and to preserve a competitive environment. All efficiently managed businesses benefit from such policies—new and small firms most of all. Recognizing this fact, the Attorney General appointed a national committee to study the antitrust laws, composed of distinguished citizens and legal experts, to recommend improvements in the substance and administration of our Federal laws to promote competition and prevent monopoly. Even prior to the submission of the report of this committee, it would be well to strengthen the deterrent to violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act by raising substantially the maximum fine that may be imposed under the act.

The increase in penalty was further recommended by the Attorney General in a message to the Vice President dated January 21, 1955, a copy of which has been placed in the RECORD.

As a former prosecutor of antitrust and monopoly cases in the State of Texas, I wholeheartedly agree that the maximum penalty contained in the present law is entirely too low. Practically every State in the Union has higher maximum fines for violation of State antitrust and monopoly laws.

Texas, for instance, which has one of the oldest and strongest antitrust laws in the Nation, permits penalties as high as \$1,500 a day for each day that the violation continues. During my 6 years as attorney general of Texas, the record shows that our State prosecuted and brought to judgment more antitrust suits than any other State in the Nation. These included suits against monopolies, price-fixing and restraint of trade among oil and gas companies, milk distributors, bread companies, butane gas companies, typewriter manufacturers, construction companies, building and trade councils, ginners, and many appliance companies, all of whom were injuring the consuming public of our State.

In all of these lawsuits involving more than 125 persons and corporations, with only 2 exceptions, our penalties were more than \$5,000, which is the present maximum penalty for violation of the Federal antitrust laws. Actually, \$5,000 would be more realistic as a minimum fine rather than a maximum if we are to use this as a real deterrent to violation of our antitrust and monopoly laws.

Stiffer penalties and proper enforcement of both State and Federal laws against trusts and monopolies are essential to the preservation of free enterprise and the protection of the public welfare. We cannot have free enterprise without free competition. Trusts and monopolies strangle competition and reap a heavy toll of exorbitant profits from the consuming public.

The fight against trusts and monopolies is a continuing battle. Congress should do everything within its power to assist in this essential responsibility of government. It is believed that the proposed increase in penalties will constitute an effective additional weapon in this conflict.

Mr. President, in addition to the amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act, recommended by the Attorney General, the bill which I am introducing would likewise amend the antitrust provision of the Wilson Tariff Act so as to increase the penalty imposed on any importers who violate the provisions of that law against trusts and monopolies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 670) to increase the penalties prescribed for violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the antitrust provisions of the Wilson Tariff Act, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], my colleague the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KEERR], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes.

With only minor and clarifying changes, this is the same as the bill I introduced last year during the 83d Congress on behalf of myself and some 24 cosponsors. It, together with others, was the subject of extensive hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, from May 11 to June 9, 1954.

While no action was taken last year on any of these several bills, including the one I introduced with 24 cosponsors, the hearings on them did arouse a na-

tionwide interest in the problem growing out of the alarming shortage of elementary and secondary school facilities.

This interest has prompted the introduction of several bills in the Senate and in the House since this Congress convened, all directed to the solution of this problem. Included among them is one (S. 5) introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], in which a number of Senators joined as cosponsors.

Specific mention is made of that bill in view of its sponsorship and because it is an emergency measure providing for a 2-year program of assistance of \$500 million a year. On the other hand, the bill I am introducing provides for a continuing program of Federal assistance because it will be a continuing problem for some years to come. And while there is no limit in the amount of assistance that may be extended, this can be determined from year to year depending upon economic and budgetary factors.

The bill last year was introduced after advising with the cosponsors, a number of representatives of educational associations and outstanding leaders in the field of education. It was the consensus of those with whom I conferred that there was little hope for the enactment of general Federal Aid for Education legislation.

We all recall the futile efforts which have been made in recent years to enact such legislation. During my 12 years of service the Senate has passed two bills to provide general Federal Aid for Education to the several States. One was passed by a vote of 58 to 22 on April 1, 1948, and the second on May 15, 1949, by even a larger vote—58 to 15. However, in each of those instances the House failed to act. The record of efforts to enact such general legislation goes beyond those years, as the Senate will recall. In fact in 1943—October 20 to be exact—such a bill was recommitted after lengthy debate on the Senate floor.

The opposition to proposals to provide general Federal aid for education stemmed from a fear that Federal aid would open the door for Federal control and supervision of the public school systems of the several States.

In view of this history, it was obvious that Federal participation in any kind of nationwide educational program should be limited. This has been done in this bill. A working arrangement between the Federal Government and the several States is proposed in financing the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities. It is patterned in principle after the Hill-Burton Act, which provides Federal aid for the construction of hospitals and mental institutions, and also after the law providing for Federal aid for highways. Those laws have been in operation for a number of years and the administration of them has thoroughly demonstrated that we can have Federal aid without Federal interference or control. The Federal Government exercises no control, supervision, or authority over the operation of hospitals which have been constructed with Federal assistance under the Hill-Burton Act.

As a further safeguard, the bill provides that when any of the funds allocated to a State are paid into the State Treasury they become funds of the State to which it was paid. It further provides:

Except as specifically provided by this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any State agency, school agency, or school to which any funds have been or may be paid under this act.

So, Mr. President, there cannot be, and there will not be, any Federal authority, control, or supervision of our public school systems under the proposed legislation.

Under the provisions of this bill not one dollar appropriated by the Congress under the authorization proposed in it can be used to pay any part of the operating expenses of any school that would be or might hereafter become eligible for the assistance this measure would provide. It is limited solely to Federal financial assistance to the several States for the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities.

But its enactment would operate to free local revenues of many school districts from a part of the future debt service obligations which they would have to incur for the construction of buildings. The funds thus released would be available for general administrative expenses and for increases in the pay of teachers. In effect, this would be of direct general assistance to school districts in this indirect way without permitting any supervision or control over the affairs of their schools by the Federal Government.

Under the terms of the bill each State desiring to participate in the proposed program would, among other things, be required to submit a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act within such State, setting forth on the basis of a statewide inventory existing school facilities and a survey of the need for additional school facilities within such State. The State plan would also have to provide means whereby each school agency within the State shall have reasonable notice of the provisions of this act and opportunity to apply for a project grant or grants, and to be heard in support of such application, before the State plan is approved by the State agency for submission to the Commissioner of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Such plan would further prescribe the principles adopted for determining the relative priority of projects and allotment of Federal and State funds to projects included in such plans, taking into account (a) the relative urgency of the need within the different areas of the State for additional school facilities and (b) the relative financial resources of the several school agencies within the State.

It, therefore, is the intent of this proposed legislation to channel the Federal funds, or the major portion thereof, into States where the greatest need for assistance exists and also down into the areas, localities, and particular school districts

where additional school facilities are needed the most and where the local school revenues are presently inadequate to provide such facilities and at the same time to pay the operating costs necessary to maintain a reasonable minimum standard for elementary and secondary schools.

To carry out that intent, the bill sets forth a formula for the allocation of Federal appropriations to the several States. This formula is based on the number of school students and the per capita income of the State as compared to the average per capita income of the Nation.

This formula, or one very similar to it, must be used in any Federal aid for education program if we are to move effectively toward the much-desired objective of providing equal educational opportunities for all our children.

Possibly no formula yet suggested is perfect, but the one used in this bill is workable and is substantially fair and equitable. It surely will operate to channel such Federal assistance as the Congress may be willing to authorize into those areas and districts where school facilities are inadequate or are deemed unsatisfactory.

During the hearings on a similar bill last year I said on several occasions, and I repeat with emphasis now, that it is the solution of the problem in which I am interested rather than quibbling over the merits of formulas.

The several formulas used in the bills introduced last year were thoroughly analyzed and discussed by experts who appeared as witnesses before the Subcommittee on Education during its hearings on those bills. Extensive general hearings on the subject of Federal Aid for School Construction were conducted also by a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor on October 6, 7, and 8, 1954, pursuant to House Resolution 115. I refer Members of the Senate to the testimony as contained in the record of both of those hearings for a complete analysis and explanation of the theories underlying the several formulas studied, and as to how they would work out in practice in the distribution of appropriated funds among the several States. At pages 299 and 300 of the record of the hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Education there is a table which I inserted in the record and which was prepared at my request by the staff of the Commissioner of Education. This table shows how, under the formula used in this bill, a stated amount of money—\$95 million in this instance—would be distributed to the several States.

Many Members of the Senate as well as the House, representatives of a number of education associations, outstanding educators, and prominent citizens deeply concerned about the problem appeared during those hearings or submitted statements for the record. It was the unequivocal opinion of most of those witnesses that the Federal Government should recognize its responsibility in this national crisis of school-facility shortage, and urged immediate action on this bill or a similar one as a logical and

sound Federal-State cooperative approach to its solution.

What is this crisis?

The following quotation from the statement of Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, Commissioner of Education, submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on Education and included in the record of its hearings of last year at pages 318 et seq., gives some startling figures with respect to the status of our elementary and secondary school facilities:

You have heard many witnesses reinforce evidence of the need for school construction. There is no question as to the need for construction of additional school facilities. The first phase of the recently completed school facilities survey, conducted under title 1 of Public Law 815, indicated a shortage in 1952 of 312,000 instructional rooms of public elementary and secondary schools. The 1954 shortage is estimated to be approximately 340,000.

These figures do not include the buildings needed for higher education. Neither do they provide for the increased enrollment ahead. The situation of classroom shortage has not suddenly occurred. It has been developing over a considerable number of years. If we are to meet current needs, we must build 117,000 new classrooms annually. We built in each of the years of 1951, 1952, and 1953, approximately 50,000. We are thus falling behind at the rate of 67,000 classrooms annually. Assuming merely a continuation of the 1953 rate of construction and obsolescence, the backlog for 1960 would be 507,000 classrooms. To construct the approximately 340,000 classrooms needed now, without regard to the increased enrollments ahead, would cost roughly \$10 billion to \$12 billion.

When we look at these figures in relation to the enrollment forecasts of the Nation it becomes apparent that the school-construction problem is a very big one and one that will continue over many years.

The figures included in this quotation from Dr. Brownell's statement were taken from the Report of the Status Phase of the School Facilities Survey, authorized by title I, Public Law 815, 81st Congress, published in December 1953, and reflect the status and condition of our elementary and secondary school facilities in 43 States as of the commencement of the school year 1952-53. This survey, as we know, was conducted by the educational agencies of the respective States in cooperation with and coordinated by the School Housing Section of the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. While the survey covers only 43 States, data for the 5 States not included in it are available, and some if not most of the statistical information contained in the report has been revised by individuals and associations to reflect the facts with respect to the status and condition of these school facilities in all 48 States as of September 1954.

I invite the attention of the Senate to this report because it gives a graphic description of the status and condition of our elementary and secondary school facilities. The facts disclosed by the 43 charts in the report, supported by the statistical data contained in the 43 tables that make up the appendix of it, give a picture of the status and condition of such facilities that is startling and deplorable.

As an example, 35.1 percent of our school plants are rated as unsatisfactory. In this category are rented quarters and other facilities not suitable or adaptable to school purposes; barracks buildings or similar structures not designed for school use, and makeshift quarters in buildings redesigned for classrooms. This means that approximately 22.9 percent of our school population are housed in unsatisfactory plants, and approximately 22.8 percent are attending school in buildings not meeting fire-safety conditions—a polite definition for firetraps.

Inasmuch as the statistics in that report are not revised to date, it should be borne in mind that, based on the present rate of construction and obsolescence and taking into consideration the rate of increase in our school population, 70,000 classrooms are being added annually to the present 340,000 backlog of shortage mentioned in the quoted excerpts from Commissioner Brownell's statement submitted to the Subcommittee on Education last year.

On December 2, 1954, the Special Committee on Federal Aid for School Construction submitted its unanimous report to the House of Representatives. This report is based upon extensive hearings conducted by that committee in October of last year. Here is what that report has to say about the problem:

There is no question that more classrooms are urgently needed. This need has been repeatedly demonstrated by school facilities surveys, by reports from State governors, and by testimony during extensive subcommittee hearings. It will cost from ten to twelve billion dollars to provide adequate classrooms for children now enrolled, and enrollment will increase markedly in the next few years. The hearings held by the subcommittee have demonstrated that the national interest requires that the Federal Government join with State and local governments in solving this pressing problem. Adequate education for our children is essential to the preservation of a free and strong Nation. Their education must not be impaired by the serious classroom shortages which exist in every State.

In fact, the problem created by our school facilities shortage is so great and pressing that it is recognized as a crisis not only by education associations, educators, and others charged with administrative responsibilities in connection with our public schools, but by parents of school-age children and casual observers throughout the country. The shortage is growing steadily and rapidly, and it is and will continue to be one of our most urgent national problems.

The problem was so acute more than 2 years ago that General Eisenhower, then a candidate for President, recognizing the urgency of the problem and the need for Federal assistance in school facility construction, said in his speech in Los Angeles on October 2, 1952:

Another part of the task ahead concerns the conservation of our greatest asset: Our Nation's children. Part of this responsibility belongs to our schools.

American education is a living testimonial to the devotion, the intelligence, the deep concern, and sacrificial service for America's future on the part of tens of thousands of school teachers and school officials. Also

laymen and women in thousands of communities have served and are serving the cause of education.

But here, again, we must honestly face the fact that in too many places we are not adequately meeting the school needs of America's children. More than 10 percent of all our public school classrooms are now seriously overcrowded. By 1958 it is estimated that our school system will have a shortage of 600,000 classrooms. This year 1,700,000 American boys and girls were without any school facilities.

The American answer is to do—in this field—what we have been doing for a long time in other fields.

We have helped the States build highways and local farm-to-market roads. We have provided Federal funds to help the States build hospitals and mental institutions.

Then, as President, General Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 7, 1954, stated:

Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population. The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public education policy, is a State and local responsibility. However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings.

And again in his recent state of the Union message delivered to the joint session of the Congress on January 6, 1955, the President reiterated his recognition of the urgency of the problem in these words:

It is the right of every American, from childhood on, to have access to knowledge. In our form of society this right of the individual takes on a special meaning, for the education of all our citizens is therefore imperative to the maintenance and invigoration of America's free institutions.

Today we face grave educational problems. Up-to-date analyses of these problems and their solutions are being carried forward through the individual State conferences, and the White House conferences to be completed this year.

However, such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage. This shortage is of immediate concern to all our people. Affirmative action must be taken now.

Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, our localities, communities, or families, the Federal Government should serve as an effective agent in dealing with this problem. I shall forward a special message to the Congress on February 15, presenting a program dealing with this shortage.

All of us who are deeply concerned about this problem anxiously await the President's recommendations as may be contained in his special message to the Congress on February 15.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 686) to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REOPENING OF BIDS AND NEGOTIATIONS ON SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANT, BAYTOWN, TEX.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to reopen bidding and negotiations on the synthetic rubber plant in Baytown, Tex. An identical bill has been introduced in the House today by Representative ALBERT THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that following the printing of the bill a statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 691) to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex., was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. DANIEL is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL

By an unfortunate combination of circumstances the Baytown synthetic rubber plant, which has been operated since the beginning of the synthetic rubber industry in America by the General Tire & Rubber Co., did not receive a suitable bid during the negotiations of the Rubber Disposal Commission. In the opinion of all the experts, both technical and economic, the Baytown plant is an excellent facility, can compete readily in a private synthetic rubber industry, and in the national interest should be included in the recommendations for the disposition of Government synthetic rubber plants.

This bill would provide authority for the Rubber Disposal Commission to reopen bidding for a period of 30 days and negotiations for an additional 30-day period on this rubber plant.

In order to avoid any delay in the congressional consideration of the overall disposal program, expeditious action is necessary in the consideration of this bill. I urge in behalf of myself and my colleague that the appropriate committee and the Senate take early action on this bill.

EXTENSION OF EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS UNDER VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I had an agreement with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to be a cosponsor with him, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], of a bill to extend benefits to GI's now in the service. However, through an inadvertence, the names of the junior Senator from Massachusetts and myself were omitted. I now ask unanimous consent that we be listed from this point on as cosponsors of the bill (S. 306) to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes, and that any future printing of the bill

shall show the names of the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report on the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, transmitted to the Senate by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission on January 6, 1955, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

Statement by him on January 22, 1955, commemorating the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO ATTEND SPRING SERIES OF ATOMIC TESTS AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative CARL DURHAM and I have today mailed to each Member of Congress a letter inviting them to attend the spring series of atomic tests to be conducted at the Nevada test site.

I sincerely hope that every Member who possibly can will arrange to attend one of these test operations. Atomic weapons are the keystone of our defenses against militant communism, and the better-informed Members of Congress are concerning this vital weapon the better we all will be equipped to deal effectively with the problems of defense and foreign relations which now press so urgently upon us.

The trip will require approximately 5 days. This may seem like a rather long period to be absent from Washington. However, the requirements of public safety, which are a paramount concern of the Atomic Energy Commission, require that weather conditions be ideal for a test before a shot can be fired. I am sure that every Member of Congress will wholeheartedly support this prudent approach on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission. Since one cannot predict ahead of time the precise day on which a test can be fired, the Commission has suggested that the Members plan a 5-day visit. I can assure them that the 5 days will not be wasted. In addition to observing a test shot, the Members will be given a nontechnical briefing concerning the test program

and the method of conducting tests, and will be given an opportunity to observe the results of previous tests. If conditions permit, the Members will also have an opportunity to see firsthand the results of the test which they observe.

The Members will be transported to and from the test site in pressurized-cabin aircraft of the Military Air Transport Command, a service whose record for safe and comfortable flying is second to none in the world. I should like to assure the distinguished lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] that adequate facilities will be provided for any Congresswomen who would like to go. Several attended the tests in 1953 and have reported that they found the trip to be exceedingly worthwhile in carrying out their official responsibilities as Members of Congress, and that in addition the trip was a most pleasant and enjoyable one.

In closing I should like to recall the old Chinese proverb: "One look is worth a thousand words." This proverb is particularly apt as regards atomic weapons, for atomic weapons are a force that is so new and so different that they must be seen to be fully comprehended. I therefore again urge every Member of Congress who can possibly do so to take this opportunity personally to observe an atomic test.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I be permitted to insert the text of the letter which has been sent to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
January 21, 1955.

DEAR FRIEND: The Members of Congress who observed the atomic test series in Nevada in the spring of 1953 found the experience to be so worthwhile that on behalf of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission we would like to invite you to witness one of the atomic tests in the 1955 series in Nevada.

The AEC has informed me that tests are planned for the weeks of February 20, February 27, and April 3. Transportation will be provided by MATS four-engined, pressurized cabin aircraft. The Members of Congress will be quartered at the Air Force Base at Indian Springs, Nev. Adequate facilities will be available for any Congresswoman desiring to make the trip. Planes are scheduled to depart from the MATS terminal at Washington National Airport Sunday mornings, February 20, 27, and April 3, and fly direct to Indian Springs. Test shots may be fired on any day that weather conditions are satisfactory. The planes will return to Washington the evening following the shot but in no event later than Friday of the same week. The party will have an opportunity to tour the test site and visit a shot area after a test if conditions permit. A non-technical briefing concerning the shot is also planned.

If you are interested, would you kindly fill out the attached form at your early convenience, indicating the particular week when you wish to attend. Because of logistic problems involved in handling a large party at the test site, it will be necessary for Members planning to make a trip to notify the committee office no later than 4 days before scheduled departure. We have asked Ed

Heller of the committee staff to serve as liaison officer for the test series. He will be available to answer any questions you may have concerning the trip.

The safety of citizens living in areas adjacent to the test site is a paramount concern of the AEC in conducting these tests. It is therefore necessary that weather conditions be ideal for the test before a shot can be fired. There is, therefore, the possibility that weather conditions may prevent the firing of any test detonation before the scheduled plane return Friday.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

CARL T. DURHAM,
Vice Chairman.

GROUND-BREAKING EXERCISES FOR THE NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the New Senate Office Building Commission, I am happy to announce that at 11 a. m. on Wednesday, January 26, ground-breaking ceremonies for the New Senate Office Building will be held at the site, First Street between B and C Streets NE. The Senate Office Building Commission extends a cordial invitation to the membership and officers of the Senate to join with us at this ceremony.

I remind Senators that the ceremonies will be held on next Wednesday, January 26, and I hope that all Senators will be able to be there.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on February 21 an international tariff-negotiating conference will convene in Geneva, Switzerland, under the sponsorship of the countries associated in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. The purpose of this conference will be tariff negotiations looking to Japan's full accession to the general agreement, thus enlarging her trade possibilities with other countries as well as with the United States.

The forthcoming conference, like the President's recommendations for additional authority to negotiate tariff reductions on a gradual, selective and reciprocal basis, involves matters of the highest importance.

Much is at stake for America and for the people of Connecticut. An increase in trade among the nations of the free world will add to the security of the United States. As loyal, patriotic Americans we of Connecticut, of course, want our country to be in a position of maximum strength in the struggle against international communism in which we have been so long engaged.

However, in any tariff negotiations entered by the United States, care must be exercised to observe faithfully the principles of gradualness, selectivity, and reciprocity enunciated by President Eisenhower. As citizens of a highly industrialized State, we of Connecticut want our economy maintained at a high level, with expanding opportunities for employment. Our Connecticut economy, like others in the Nation, could be injured, with serious effects upon employment, if

tariffs were cut on an indiscriminate and injudicious basis.

In a recent letter to Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, I urged that our negotiators at the Geneva conference keep uppermost in their minds what I have called the paycheck peril point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on these matters be included in the body of the RECORD at the close of my remarks, together with excerpts from an interview by Mr. William A. Garrett, Washington correspondent of the Hartford (Conn.) Times in which I expressed my views on the President's foreign economic policy.

There being no objection, the statement and the excerpts from the interview were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUSH

In a letter to Samuel C. Waugh, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, I have strongly called attention to the "paycheck peril point" which should be an ever-present danger signal to our negotiators at the Geneva Conference on tariffs.

Through Mr. Waugh, who is in charge of the trade-agreements program, I have urged the Department of State to keep constantly in mind the serious threat to Connecticut employment which might result from indiscriminate tariff reductions on products produced domestically and in foreign countries where an extremely low-wage level prevails.

A number of Connecticut industries may be vulnerable to unfair competition of foreign industries paying substandard wages. Among examples which come readily to mind are the rubber footwear industry, in the Naugatuck Valley, the hat industry in Danbury, vacuum bottles in Norwich and New Britain, flashlights in Bridgeport and New Haven, the bicycle industry in Torrington, the lace industry and our clock and watch industry.

Connecticut workers in these industries receive wages which are far higher than those paid by their foreign competitors. A startling example of the wage differential is furnished by the rubber footwear industry. Cheap canvas and waterproof footwear, made in Hong Kong by coolies getting starvation wages, already is being offered for sale in this country. I am informed that male packers in Hong Kong rubber footwear plants receive the pitifully small sum of 8 cents an hour, in comparison with the \$2.05 earned by packers in our Naugatuck plants.

In some cases, the lower wage rates paid abroad may be offset by the greater skill and productivity of American workers, and by the superiority of our production methods. It is impossible to believe, however, that such factors can close a gap so great as that between the starvation levels prevailing in Hong Kong and the wage standards which our Connecticut workers earn and deserve.

American industries and the skilled workmen and women who man their machines have nothing to fear from fair competition. But the peoples' representatives in Washington, whether in Congress or the executive branch, must remain on the alert to nip in the bud unfair methods of competing. And some foreign producers are not reluctant to resort to unfair methods. An example was the use of a thin leather insert in rubber-soled footwear to get a leather shoe classification and thus evade the intent of Congress in establishing the duty on such products. This evasion was halted last year by the Bush-Sadlak bill adopted by the 83d Congress.

In carrying on negotiations at Geneva, our representatives will have the guidance of "peril-point" determinations made by the

United States Tariff Commission. I am confident that in so establishing the levels below which tariffs may not be safely reduced, members of the Tariff Commission were keenly aware of the problem created by wage differentials.

In writing to Mr. Waugh, I sought to make certain that this "paycheck peril point" is equally impressed upon the minds of those who will negotiate for the United States.

President Eisenhower's recommendations for authority to negotiate moderate tariff reductions on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis are sound, and have my support. But, in implementing the trade-agreements program, extreme care must be taken to avoid undermining the American standard of living. In the negotiations at Geneva, emphasis must be placed on selectivity and reciprocity.

In the whole wide range of products produced by American industry in partnership with labor, there are those on which tariffs may be safely reduced. Others are more vulnerable, and may need the protection they now have. Still others, indeed, may need more. Thus, the need for selectivity is apparent.

In a speech on the Senate floor on February 23, 1954, I urged that our trade agreement negotiators always keep uppermost in mind the wage differential problem. I also referred to a letter I had written to the Secretary of State informing him of the widespread feeling that there has been too little reciprocity in the so-called reciprocal trade-agreements program. Many believe we have received too little from foreign nations in return for the large concessions we have already made.

If both selectivity and reciprocity are insisted upon, as I have reminded the Department of State, trade agreements can be negotiated which will benefit our whole economy and create new opportunities for jobs. If those principles are flouted, serious consequences might result.

EXCERPTS FROM AN INTERVIEW OF SENATOR BUSH BY WILLIAM A. GARRETT, WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT OF THE HARTFORD (CONN.) TIMES, BROADCAST FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, AND SATURDAY, JANUARY 22, 1955, BY CONNECTICUT RADIO STATION

Mr. GARRETT. Senator, it's probable that tariff legislation will be among the hottest issues of this session. What did you think of the President's recommendations for cutting the tariff?

Senator BUSH. They were just about what I expected, Bill. They followed very closely the recommendations of the Randall Commission, of which I was a member, and whose report I signed. Let me point out to you and to our friends in Connecticut some key words in the President's message on this subject. The President said this:

"I request a 3-year extension of Presidential authority to negotiate tariff reductions with other nations on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis."

The key words are gradual, selective, and reciprocal. Those words, as well as other protections in the law, are very important to us in Connecticut.

Mr. GARRETT. You referred to other protections, Senator. Were you thinking of the peril point and escape clause provisions of the tariff act?

Senator BUSH. That's right, Bill, especially the so-called peril point. That provision is crucially important to us in Connecticut at the present time, and has been for some years. Before the President can enter into any trade agreement negotiations the law requires the Commission to fix the peril point below which tariffs cannot be reduced without causing serious injury to a domestic industry. So that's a safeguard against tariff cuts which might have a harmful effect. Of course, the President has recommended

that the peril point must be found before any reductions can be made.

Mr. GARRETT. Then you feel, Senator, that the President's program could be adopted without any harmful effects in Connecticut?

Senator BUSH. Yes, Bill; that's right. I've been close to this tariff situation for the past 2 years and since then. As a United States Senator representing Connecticut, I feel a particular responsibility to the thousands of working men and women in industries which might possibly be affected by tariff cuts.

As you know, we have many of our Connecticut industries which have grown up behind tariff protection. The men and women who work in those industries have their roots in our communities—in Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, Norwich, the Naugatuck Valley, and so on.

Very sudden and drastic cuts in the tariff would or could cause distress to those people—unemployment, the loss of jobs—and dislocate the economy of their communities. If anything like that were proposed, I would certainly fight against it. But the President's program doesn't propose that kind of thing at all. It is a very moderate program, carefully thought out and surrounded with safeguards. Far from harming Connecticut, therefore, it will have very beneficial results. In my judgment, it will create increased employment, and more jobs. By increasing the importation of goods that we need here—like copper, fuel oil, raw materials used by our factories—it will make possible increased opportunity for Connecticut exports. And approximately 10 percent of our employment depends on exports.

Mr. GARRETT. We have a stake, too, in the foreign policy aspects of the President's program. Is that a fair statement?

Senator BUSH. Of course, that's right, Bill. Our foreign economic policy—and that includes tariff policy—is an essential part of our program to check the spread of communism. It's a hard-headed, practical way of fighting communism. If we improve our own living standards, and help our allies among the free nations to raise their living standards, we'll be hitting the Communists where it hurts. They depend on poverty and human suffering to provide fertile grounds for their propaganda. If we can improve living standards in the free nations, it will hurt the Communists. There is no doubt about that.

But in helping other nations we mustn't forget this fact: The defense of the free world, now and for many years to come, will depend primarily upon the military strength of the United States. And a strong domestic industrial economy is the backbone of our military strength. In whatever we do we must keep that in mind. Knowing the President's views on this question, I am confident that his foreign economic policy was drafted with that thought constantly in mind.

POLICY STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Mr. Gwynn Garnett, director for the American Farm Bureau Federation of its section on international trade development, a series of excerpts from an important policy statement adopted for this great federation by the official voting delegates of the member State organizations at the 36th annual convention.

I believe that the Farm Bureau's position will be welcomed by Members of Congress as an immensely significant statement.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Garnett's letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1955.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We thought you would appreciate receiving the enclosed copy of the policies adopted by the voting delegates of American Farm Bureau Federation for 1955 on international affairs. There was an unusually broad membership participation in the formulation of these policies. They reflect some important changes from earlier Farm Bureau policies and from existing policies of the Government.

Some of the policies applicable to the work of the Foreign Relations Committee are extracted below:

Foreign investment: "The United States Government should make clear that primary reliance must be placed on private investment to assist economic development abroad. It should be made clear that United States resources for public loans are limited and inadequate in relation to total needs, and that public lending is a poor substitute for private investment."

Technical assistance: "We favor the continuation and improvement of the technical-assistance program as an important part of our foreign policy."

Foreign aid: "We believe that economic aid on a grant basis seldom accomplishes its intended purpose, but instead tends to weaken our economy as well as that of the recipient, and often diminishes United States prestige abroad. Except in disasters, we recommend that monetary grants be replaced by loans which assure the opportunity to repay the United States in goods or services. These loans should be made through banking institutions on a sound basis with provisions to repay in goods which complement our economy, or in goods or services which would otherwise require United States dollar appropriations."

Sales for foreign currency: "The Secretary of Agriculture should authorize the sale and export of farm products through private trade channels, under limitations determined by him, in exchange for foreign currencies. These foreign currencies should not be used to supplement foreign-aid programs in ways not authorized by Congress. The use of currencies should emphasize the building of continuous foreign markets on a sound basis."

"We believe that a substantial part of the frozen assets of CCC can be converted into working assets needed to increase the ability of foreign countries to earn foreign exchange. We recommend that the authority to sell surpluses for foreign currency be expanded, so long as the currencies can be used for constructive purposes."

Stockpiling strategic materials: "High United States standards of living and military security both require increasing quantities of basic materials such as manganese and chromium. The United States is increasingly dependent on imports for these critical supplies. Many of the underdeveloped countries have vast reserves of these materials."

"The United States should enter into long-term agreements to purchase basic materials to greatly expand our national security reserves. These security stockpiles should be isolated from normal domestic requirements and used only in case of a national emergency."

"Such a program would not only contribute to the economic and political stability and purchasing power of friendly countries, but it would also further the security and economic welfare of the United States and contribute to expanding trade."

Foreign military aid: "Foreign military aid should assist our allies to build up their own defense resources rather than to supply military goods produced in the United States. The dispersion of the vast expenditures for defense among cooperating nations will not only provide purchasing power in the hands of other nations but will also avoid undue concentration of defense production in the United States, which tends to unbalance our own economy and encourages allies to let us carry an increasing burden for the common defense."

United Nations: "The United Nations is a force for world peace. Though it has failed to solve some problems, it has succeeded in solving others. Where there is discussion, there is hope."

"We favor continued financial support of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. However, we insist that these funds be allocated to the specialized agencies in a manner similar to that now being used and that the funds and program be administered on a decentralized basis. We oppose centralizing the use and administration of funds for specialized agencies in the United Nations. We believe that the charter of the United Nations should be reviewed."

We think that these policies are particularly applicable to the proposed program for the economic development of South and Southeast Asia. We shall be glad to discuss these policies with you in detail at your convenience.

Respectfully yours,

GWYNN GARNETT,
Director, International Trade
Development.

THE SHORTAGE OF CLASSROOMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, along with my colleagues, I was pleased to hear today from Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, writing on the urgent subject of a Federal program to meet the pressing problem of the deplorable shortage of classrooms in our Nation.

It is obvious that strong steps must be taken in order to enable the States to be adequate to the educational needs of the youngsters who are, after all, the future citizens of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mrs. Leonard's letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
January 21, 1955.

To: Members of the 84th Congress.

From: Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, president,
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, with its nearly 9 million memberships in 39,000 PTA's, takes great hope from the state of the Union message recently delivered to Congress by the President of the United States. His reference to the "grave educational problems" and his declaration that "such factors as population growth, additional responsibilities of schools, and increased and longer school attendance have produced an unprecedented classroom shortage" show that he is cognizant of the needs that are demanding attention. We agree most emphatically with his statement, "This shortage is of immediate concern to all of our people. Affirmative action must be taken now."

The members of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers have been convinced—their convictions based on many

surveys made in various parts of the country—that the classroom shortage is critical in nature and national in scope. We have, as an organization, testified before the subcommittees of both the Senate and the House, urging the Congress to pass an emergency construction bill.

During these early days of the 84th Congress many bills on school construction have been introduced into both houses and referred to their respective committees. The President of the United States has said that he will "forward a special message to the Congress on February 15, presenting a program dealing with this shortage." From the bills that have been introduced and the message from the President, we have hope of positive action. The members of the two committees, all of whom have evidenced great statesmanship in expressing themselves as sympathetic to emergency aid to school construction, will, we trust, quickly select the best from all suggestions and present such legislation as can readily be passed by the 84th Congress and signed by the President. The situation has gone far beyond meager measures. We need a realistic program that can, and will, aid the critical situation facing the country as a whole.

The needs of children cannot wait. Children cannot be placed in a storehouse with the caption, "Do Not Grow Until We Have Classrooms Ready For You. Then We'll Give a Signal To Grow." No. Growth is daily, and children are this country's most precious resource. We must not fail them now. We, the parents and teachers of the land, and you, the legislators whom we helped to elect, must join forces and together act immediately for these our children.

We have confidence in you. We trust your integrity and your leadership. We also assure you that you can trust us to do our share to speed this necessary legislation. The PTA membership of this country is alerted to the need. The membership will act.

VACANCY IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, for nearly 9 months there has been a vacancy in the United States District Court for the State of Oregon. This situation has imposed a severe strain on the judicial process in my State. Both my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and I have tried to cooperate to the fullest extent to see that the vacancy is filled. We have given clearance and would not interpose any objection to the names mentioned by various Republican Party groups in the State. Accordingly, I have sent to the Attorney General today a letter suggesting the appointment of Hon. Edward C. Kelly, of Medford, Oreg., for the position, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1955.

The Honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: For nearly 9 months a seat on the United States District Court for the State of Oregon has been vacant. In order to maintain a reasonable pace with the caseload, the assignment of visiting judges to this court has been necessary. Furthermore, the strain of the additional work on the other judges has endangered their health.

Both Senator MORSE, my senior colleague, and I have tried to cooperate to the fullest

in order to encourage an early filling of the vacancy. We both have stated publicly our intention not to invoke the objection of "personally obnoxious" against the candidates mentioned by various Republican Party groups in the State. In my own case, I even have declared that I would not voice this objection against ex-Senator Cordon, were he to be named to the seat, in spite of the recent bitter campaign between him and me in Oregon.

Yet, the court vacancy still has not been filled, to the detriment of orderly judicial proceedings in our State.

While I have assumed this was an appointment to be made on the basis of Republican Party recommendations, I think the time has come for Democrats to make a definite recommendation if the Republicans are unable to do so.

Accordingly, I should like to propose to you for the seat on the district court in Oregon the name of Hon. Edward C. Kelly, of Medford, Oreg. Mr. Kelly is an outstanding member of the bar, a descendant of a distinguished pioneer Oregon family, a war veteran, a father of three law students, and a man of great integrity, ability, and capacity for public service. I feel sure that any investigation of Mr. Kelly's qualifications made by your office would confirm these facts.

I trust you will give this recommendation serious and careful consideration.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a measure to enable the strategic American Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to become States of the United States is under active consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Members of the Senate will recall that during the 83d Congress we were unable to obtain any reports on the Alaska measure from the appropriate executive agencies, although two Republican chairmen of the committee, the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska and the Senator from Oregon, the Honorable Guy Cordon, both sought such reports.

At its initial meeting in the 84th Congress, the committee, by unanimous action, authorized me, as its chairman, once again to seek the views of the appropriate agencies of the executive branch of the Government on statehood for Alaska. Accordingly, on behalf of the committee I have directed specific inquiry to the Secretary of Defense, requesting a clear statement as to what effect, if any, admission of Alaska and Hawaii would have upon our national security. Because the matter is one of grave importance to all of us, I ask that my letter to Secretary Wilson be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. When a reply is received from the Defense Department, I shall request that it appear in the body of the RECORD also, so that all Members of Congress may be fully informed on the matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1955.

HON. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY WILSON: The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, at

its initial meeting of the 84th Congress on January 20, 1955, instructed me, as chairman, to submit to the Department of Defense the bill S. 49, enabling Alaska and Hawaii to become States of the United States, and urgently to request the Department's views and comments on the proposed legislation.

The committee is especially desirous of obtaining from the Defense Department a clear statement of the effect, if any, the admission of these two strategic American Territories as States would have upon our national security. If the Department is of the opinion that their admission would not be in the best interests of national security, the Senators on the committee are strongly of the opinion that they and the American people, and especially our loyal and brave citizens in those Territories, are entitled to a full and frank statement of the facts and the reasoning upon which such a conclusion is based.

In this connection, your attention is respectfully called to President Eisenhower's unequivocal support of immediate statehood for Hawaii and his endorsement of the principle of statehood for Alaska in his state of the Union message on January 6 of this year. Reference also is made to the several previous reports of the Department of Defense unequivocally supporting statehood as furthering our national security.

S. 49, 84th Congress, is identical in all major respects to the statehood measures that were thoroughly debated in the Senate last year and which passed the Senate by a very substantial majority. The bills which passed the Senate last year, S. 49 and S. 50, 83d Congress, as a combined measure, were both submitted to the Department of Defense well over a year before their passage in the Senate, but no report was received on the Alaska measure.

In view of the fact that the Department is thoroughly familiar with both the policy question, which has been before the American people for many, many years, and the detailed provisions of the proposed legislation, the committee further directed me to request a prompt reply to this request.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should state that I have sent a similar letter to the Secretary of State requesting his views as to what effect, if any, the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States would have upon our foreign relations, and also whether the asserted boundaries for the proposed States were consistent with our recognized sovereignty in international law.

I have directed still another inquiry to the Secretary of the Interior, requesting his views on the administrative feasibility of the provisions of S. 49.

It is greatly in the interests of the people of the United States as well as the loyal and brave American citizens of those two American Territories that these questions be answered fully and frankly.

In connection with the question of statehood for Alaska, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Cordova Chamber of Commerce, of Cordova, Alaska. This letter supports statehood, but outlines some of the problems the Territory is facing.

I firmly believe, Mr. President, that if S. 49, the statehood measure now before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, were to become law the people of Alaska themselves could take action

that would go a long way toward solving the problems outlined in the letter of the Cordova Chamber of Commerce. I know that many Members of the Senate concur in my conviction in this respect.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORDOVA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Cordova, Alaska, January 13, 1955.
Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I wish to congratulate you for your stand on statehood for Alaska. We of Alaska realize, if given a chance, we can and will show the doubting Members that we can succeed as a state, and will become one to be proud of. Our natural resources, if exploited, will soon class us as one of the richest States in the Union. Our tax revenues alone will become a great factor in the support of our country, making the good old United States of America that much stronger.

We realize we are, in the minds of many residents of the United States, a long way from home. However, it is only 6 hours by air from our largest city, Anchorage, to Seattle. A few years ago that same trip took 6 full days by passenger boat, but time has changed all that. Last February I left home—Cordova, Alaska—on a Friday morning at 9 o'clock and enjoyed lunch in Washington, D. C. The next day—less time than it used to take to travel by train from one end of California to the other.

We in Alaska are rich in many ways, very poor in others. Our greatest need is highways. Roads bring settlers and make it possible to market our products close to home. Today many communities must depend on steamer or air freight—steamer freight at 90 cents a cubic foot (and already 10 days old when it arrives in Cordova), or 20 cents a pound by air freight. Can you imagine a head of lettuce, costing 20 cents in Seattle, being enjoyed by us with the additional 10 to 20 cents for freight? With roads connecting us to the farming areas of Alaska, we could enjoy the same head of lettuce for very little more than the Seattle price.

Fish processed and canned in Alaska journeys to Seattle and back again via steamer, drastically increasing the cost, while by truck our small packers could market their product directly to interior Alaska, quickly and cheaply.

Yet with these conditions prevalent and our population growing by leaps and bounds, Congress has seen fit to cut our road appropriations over 100 percent from the 1952-53 total. We ask—Why? For example, the 1952-53 road appropriation was to start a \$12 million highway program—the Copper River Highway from Cordova to Chitna—to be constructed in 4 years. We were assigned \$650,000 with which to begin construction. During the 1954-55 session, one Member pointed out that by taking advantage of already existing, abandoned steel railroad bridges Congress could, by granting \$2,400,000, reconstruct miles of these before they collapsed, thereby saving millions of dollars on this roadbuilding program.

I would like to stop for a moment and thank the Senate of that year for raising the House appropriation from \$12 million to \$14,850,000, making it possible for the above conferee committeeman to earmark this \$2,400,000 for the Copper River Highway. That same man assigned \$700,000 more in the 1954-55 session to complete the crossing of the Copper River Delta, out of the total \$9 million road appropriation for that year.

We understand that this year only \$8 million is being asked for highways in Alaska, none of which is earmarked for the Copper River Highway. Does not the expenditure of \$4 million on this highway justify further

funds this year to keep the road under construction? It is true that it will take this year to finish this section, but with no additional funds, we will lose next year's construction season. We must have allocated funds ahead.

I understand that it is not too late to influence the Budget Committee to vote additional funds for this project. The question of our gas tax has been raised in the committee, leaving them reluctant to give us added road moneys. The old adage, "Help yourselves, and we will help you," seems to be the prevailing attitude. However, we have been assured by our own legislators that our gas tax will be doubled—from 2 cents to 4 cents—this February. Go along with us? Use your influence to persuade the Bureau of the Budget to allot \$15 million instead of only \$8 million. If our legislature does not come across with the promised tax increase, you will still be able to cut the appropriation. Allot \$5 million, at least, for the Copper River Highway project. We will then be able to construct the road from both ends. Next year's appropriation could finish the job.

Help us to help Alaska become the State all America can be proud of. The Copper River Highway will traverse the richest mineral area and the most scenic section of all Alaska, bar none. The old railroad bed of the Copper River Northwestern Railway, which we are converting to a highway, poured \$257 million worth of mineral wealth through Cordova during its 25 years of operation. Today's value would be treble that amount.

The railroad was built in 1910, 1911, and 1912 at an expense of over \$20 million. It would cost, conservatively, \$60 million today, yet a highway taking advantage of the many steel bridges and the roadbed will cost not over \$15 million. Is this not conservation? Has it not earned its way already by the returns of this wealth already poured indirectly into the coffers of Uncle Sam?

We are confident of your support in this worthy cause. Please let me hear from you soon.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN LEFEVRE,
Chairman, Road Committee,
Cordova Chamber of Commerce.

ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, preparatory to holding hearings on President Eisenhower's Economic Report by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, I believe it well to review the accomplishments of 1954. Indeed, as the President indicated in his State of the Union message of last Thursday:

The past year—1954—was one of the most prosperous years in our history. Business activity now surges with new strength. Production is rising. Employment is high. Personal income after taxes is at a record level. So is consumer spending.

The year 1954 was far different from the year of gloom and doom which some politicians tried to characterize it last October and November.

Based upon the excellent record of the economy in 1954, which saw a decrease in Federal spending of nearly \$6 billion, the predictions are for greater economic progress in 1955. The outlook for this year is well summarized in an article entitled "Business Roundup," which appeared in Fortune magazine for January 1955. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, that the economy is as prosperous as it is today, is a real tribute to the efforts of the Republican 83d Congress to strengthen the free enterprise system. This it did by passing legislation with four general purposes in mind: First, getting the Federal Government out of business; second, encouraging private enterprise to expand its production facilities; third, ending regulatory controls and other interferences with private business operations; and fourth, cutting Government spending.

In a few words, this action of the Republican 83d Congress has again permitted the profit motive of our free enterprise system to perform its vital functions. It is the anticipation of profits that provides the incentive to the undertaking of investment in an economy which is characterized by risk. Profits and losses are motivating forces which bring about readjustments in the allocation of resources—of land, labor, and capital to different industries.

It is this private profit system which has given to us Americans the highest levels of living in the world. It is the same motive factor which has enabled the economy to make the basic readjustments it did in 1953 and 1954 and which makes the prospect for continued economic progress so bright in 1955.

Because the profit motive has been subject to abuse from many sources, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have an editorial entitled *Profits and Progress*, written by Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, grand master of the National Grange, and appearing in the *National Grange Monthly* for November, 1954, printed at this point in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

PROFITS AND PROGRESS

(By Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange)

Let there be no doubt about it, the Grange believes in the American system of capitalism. Farmers are capitalists, and proud of it. They believe in the free enterprise system. This organization has long felt that the profit motive is a primary stimulus for incentive and progress. A tax system, or any set of governmental regulations or institutions, that destroys the possibility of making reasonable profits is deadly. It is the beginning of the end of our enviable level of living.

This editorial is prompted by current vicious attacks, both direct and implied, against profits. Numerous individuals and groups of individuals are conducting an insidious campaign of misrepresentation aimed at undermining confidence in American business and the profit it must make to continue. These attacks imply that profits are sinful and against public interest—something of which we should be ashamed. Is it a coincidence that these attacks follow the Moscow line which, to my way of thinking, is a clever, intriguing avenue of sabotage?

How can a farmer, or any other businessman, expand and provide additional goods, jobs, and services without reasonable profits?

PROFITS—LIFEBLOOD OF BUSINESS

Progress without profits is impossible. Private research is financed out of profits. Capital built out of profits has financed the development of new inventions that have added to our standard of living. Farms cannot be mechanized and improved except through reinvestment of profits. New and expanding factories, to give more employment, are the result of profits converted into capital. Without profits, capital would quickly die of starvation.

Many of us are sick and tired of seeing these insidious, slurring, uninformed barages of antiprofit and antibusiness propaganda that are born of ignorance, selfishness, malicious intent, or as a result of a conscious or unconscious following of the Kremlin doctrine.

So there shall be no misunderstanding, we are referring to reasonable profits; as in so many things, there is involved here an element of degree. We speak for moderation. We oppose excesses in anything.

Let there be no doubt about it, furthermore, that the Grange believes in regulation of business and profits where adequate competition for one reason or another does not adequately fulfill its purpose. This regulation must be carefully developed in order to safeguard against destruction of the values that the profit motive carries with it. So far, we have done a pretty good job of recognizing the delicacy of this process. That is why it is nauseating to see group after group seek legislative and other mechanisms to eliminate or materially reduce competition in their particular field. True, we need a few devices to prevent the dog-eat-dog type of competition that enables the "big" to swallow the "small." This, however, does not embrace a planned economy.

Many groups, either consciously or unconsciously, reason that competition is fine and desirable for everyone else, but not for them. They want competition to guarantee for them supplies of quality products at fair prices, and with satisfactory service. Yet they can find a thousand reasons for monopolistic devices for themselves.

The Grange, meanwhile, was largely responsible for the first antimonopoly laws. It fights against exorbitant profits, but it does not countenance attacks on the profit system itself. Nor does the Grange sanction the practice of taking a hasty look at some company's balance sheet and then carelessly quote or misquote—or yell "profiteering"—until that balance sheet is understood in terms of percentages or relativity of profits to volume, risks, investment, and so forth.

The ingredients for America's phenomenal success, in terms of progress and the good life, begin with a combination of our structure of government, plus the opportunity for business, industry, and the professions, including agriculture, to develop along lines prompted by the profit motive. Richness of a wide array of natural resources, an ingenious, energetic people with the proper attitude toward work, and the general lack of internal trade barriers have played an important part in this process. Without the profit motive the spark plug would be missing.

WARNING—POISON

Consequently, if any large bloc of our people swallow or take seriously the avalanche of poisonous, antiprofit charges now running rampant in the propaganda of several groups, I fear for the future. Ours is a system of enlightened self-interest. Some call it a peculiarly successful, slightly, but intelligently regulated free enterprise system. Whatever you call it, it has been phenomenally successful and it is dependent upon profits and the profit motive. This motive must continue to live as a desirable force in the minds and in the future of all Americans; otherwise our bountiful level of living will fall into jeopardy and the visions,

aspirations, and toll of our forefathers and our present generation will have been short lived.

EXHIBIT 1

BUSINESS ROUNDUP—A MONTHLY REPORT ON THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

BEST YEAR EVER

The year 1955 will be the best in United States business history. (Barring war.) By the end of 1954 the business upturn had burgeoned into a full-fledged recovery. Roundup's forecast now is that business will continue to improve at least through the second quarter of 1956. The Nation's output of goods and services should rise another \$24 billion by mid-1956—i. e., the annual rate of gross national production should increase from \$360 billion in the fourth quarter of last year to \$384 billion in mid-1956 (in 1953 dollars), or a trifle more than 1 percent per quarter. About \$15 billion of the projected \$24 billion rise in the annual rate of gross national production should take place in the next 12 months. Although the upswing will be slower than in 1949-51, and slower, too, than the upsurge during the past 3 months, it will suffice to make 1955 the best business year ever.

Total output in 1955 will be 4 percent higher than in 1954 and 1 percent higher than in the previous peak year, 1953. Industrial production should also be up 4 percent from 1954, but that will still leave it 3 percent below 1953, and postpone a new record for industrial production until 1956. The chief reason for the difference between the prospects for gross national production and industrial production: the steady growth in spending for services—housing, utilities, education, medical care, retail distribution, etc.

In coming months and quarters business activity may run slightly ahead of or behind Roundup's projections. Last year, for example, production at first dipped a bit faster, and recently has turned up more sharply than Roundup forecast a year ago. Yet for 1954, as a whole, industrial output was off 7 percent from 1953, as compared with the 6-percent decline forecast by Roundup in January 1954, and gross national production was down precisely the 3 percent predicted. A good many economists thought Roundup was overoptimistic when it suggested, last April, that the recession had reached bottom, and again, last July, when it predicted a \$10 billion upturn in gross national production between mid-1954 and mid-1955. Roundup was right in April, not quite optimistic enough in July.

Right now, the business upturn is running ahead of schedule, and it has been doing so since last September. At that time the FRB index of industrial production was still perched at the 124 level where it had been almost all year. But in October it rose to 126, in November to 129, and in December it probably reached 130. This rapid climb has outstripped even the "sharp rise" (to 127-128 at year-end) that Roundup forecast 2 months ago. If the FRB index continued to rise at this rate of 2 points a month, output would soon reach a new peak of 145. Such a boom, however, might well be followed by a 1956 "bust."

But the production rise will slow down, and the FRB index, instead of climbing 2 points a month, may rise only 2 points in the next 6 months. Most of the impetus for the pickup in production in the fourth quarter of 1954 came from the shift in business inventory policy—stocks that were being cut at a rate of \$5 billion a year in the third quarter of 1954 are about back to a normal replacement basis today. Production gains as sharp as those of the past 3 months are not likely to be sustained by the more gradual growth of consumption—or by a continuing acceleration of inventory accumulation. More than half the recent rise in

output was caused by a doubling of new-car assemblies (up from less than 300,000 units in September to more than 600,000 in December), and a 33 percent jump in steel operations (which rose from 60 percent to over 80 percent of capacity). Auto manufacturers are already building up dealer stocks by more than 100,000 cars a month, however, and assembly rates therefore should level out soon and decline by midyear. Steel output, too, is already running 5 percent above the probable 1955 demand level and may drop this summer before expanding again in the autumn.

With the FRB index at 130, industrial production is now close to the level Roundup projected for mid-1955. So production may stabilize from now through midyear. If it does, what will produce the renewed upswing later in the year and into 1956? The answer is that there will be steady, all-over growth in the economy, strongly encouraged by three governmental programs—for more roads, bigger exports, and lower taxes.

These programs should start exerting a major influence on the economy in 1956, and should add about \$4 billion, and perhaps twice that much, to effective economic demand. That amount by itself will lift gross national production only 1 or 2 percent, but the corollary economic activity it generates will reinforce all the growth trends in consumer expenditures, capital outlays, inventories, etc.

As always, of course, there are a few potential weak spots in the economic outlook. If residential construction, for example, should hammer along at the November rate of 1,400,000 starts annually, it may prove difficult to prevent a homebuilding letdown in 1956. Car sales, too, may sag toward the end of 1955, particularly if Detroit pushes the sale of new models aggressively this spring and fails to come up with substantially different 1956 models next autumn. And there is always the chance that business may go on a buying spree—as the buildup in stocks of cars and steel suggests—and overload itself with inventories this year. None of these possibilities is very likely, however, and even if one of them materialized that would not upset the basic uptrend of the economy. The only serious danger, a combination of all three of these boom-and-bust situations, is virtually out of the question. Undoubtedly Washington would bring credit and fiscal weapons into counterplay if they seemed to be developing simultaneously. Nevertheless there is some possibility of a renewal of mild inflationary pressures in 12 months or so.

The course of the business upswing in coming months may not be altogether smooth; much depends on business inventory policies and Federal fiscal policies. Yet as Fortune declared 2 years ago (see *Business After the Defense Boom*, December 1952) there is "no weakness in the economy of 1955 that cannot be forborne by wisdom and co-operation on the part of government and confidence and resolution on the part of business." This is still true today, even though 1954, not 1955, has proved to be what Fortune 2 years ago was calling "195X"—the year defense spending would level off at around \$40 billion. (In constant dollars (1953) the gross national production rate of \$360 billion in the fourth quarter of 1954 was remarkably close to the \$355-billion level Fortune projected for 195X.)

Defense: Outlays for defense declined by \$8 billion during 1954 instead of the \$5 billion anticipated. Spending has dropped from an annual rate of \$52 billion in mid-1953 to \$40 billion, and Secretary of Defense Wilson recently declared that approximately the present volume of expenditures must be maintained for the duration of the cold war. At best, the prospect is for a very slight dip in outlays—perhaps to a \$38-billion spending rate by mid-1956. Several contemplated increases in defense costs—i. e., rais-

ing servicemen's pay, the new reserve training program, more air defense—may well absorb all the savings realized from trimming personnel, foreign military aid, etc. Any worldwide reduction of armaments, leading to a substantial cut in United States defense outlays, hardly seems probable within the next 2 years.

The budget: There will be a deficit of some \$3 billion in the cash budget this fiscal year (about a \$6-billion deficit in the administrative budget) as compared with the \$4-billion cash deficit roundup forecast a year ago. In fiscal 1956, however, the cash budget will be in approximate balance if Congress defers the tax cuts scheduled for April 1, as President Eisenhower has recommended. And a surplus of \$5 billion or more could be realized in fiscal 1957. The chief reason: business activity will be rising steadily, and each \$4-billion rise in gross national production produces nearly \$1 billion of additional tax revenues. But with presidential elections coming up, taxes will probably be cut again in 1956 in preference to running a cash surplus in 1957. On the spending side, some net reduction in farm support outlays and a slight cut in defense should trim total Federal cash expenditures very slightly in fiscal 1956 and again in fiscal 1957, to around \$65 billion. Meanwhile, State and local spending will continue to increase \$2 billion a year—for schools, hospitals, and other services and public works. On balance, therefore, Government spending at all levels should rise from \$99 billion in fiscal 1955 to over \$100 billion in fiscal 1957.

Capital outlays: Business spending for plant and equipment has stopped declining. The total outback in 1954, in fact, was milder than expected (at \$36.3 billion, spending was off only 4 percent from 1953 instead of 6 percent). This year capital outlays will total about the same as last year, according to Fortune's surveys of business plans. The rate of spending (now below the 1954 average) will begin to turn up early in 1955 and by mid-1956 may be rising as much as \$2 billion annually.

Inventories: Business cut its stocks by \$4 billion during 1954, a decline of 5 percent, while end purchases of goods dipped only half that much. Thus most of the excess stocks built up during 1953 were disposed of last year. Business has already slowed its inventory trimming markedly, and as gross national product and final sales rise by 4 or 5 percent a year, inventory building should increase gradually to an annual rate of \$3 billion by the end of 1955, and to \$4 billion or so in the spring of 1956.

Business, of course, may rebuild its stocks even faster than that, just as it cut them unexpectedly quickly in 1954. Steel consumers and new-car dealers are already replenishing their depleted stocks rapidly. But while the output of steel and cars may slow down a bit soon, production for inventory may accelerate in other lines—textiles, building materials, etc. If business in general rebuilds its stocks too rapidly in 1955—by \$5 billion or more—the economy might well develop another case of inventory indigestion in 1956. However, business is becoming increasingly orderly in its long-term inventory policies, and total amount of inventory accumulation in 1955 will probably run between \$2 billion and, at most, \$4 billion.

Construction: The building boom provided the strongest antidote to the 1953-54 recession, and construction activity should contribute substantially to the 1955-56 economic expansion. Home building began picking up last fall from the 1 million unit rate to which it declined as a result of the 1953 hard-money pinch. Mortgage funds became plentiful during 1954, of course, and credit terms for VA and FHA mortgages were progressively liberalized. Consequently, as the builders themselves forecast last spring (April Roundup), housing starts rose to

1,200,000 last year. The seasonally adjusted home-building rate reached 1,250,000 in October and in November soared to 1,400,000, reflecting excellent building weather for an off-season month. But this rate can hardly be maintained, much less increased further. For such a rate would imply too fast a tapping of the replacement market for housing. (See the *Insatiable Market for Housing*, February 1954.) Moreover, there may not be enough mortgage money readily available at current terms and interest rates for that much building. (See *Credit below*.) Consequently, home building cannot be expected to rise much above 1,300,000 in 1955. Nevertheless the dollar volume of building will probably rise slightly this year since builders are putting up larger houses and homeowners are spending heavily for expansion and modernization.

Public-works construction increased by nearly \$1 billion in 1954—to \$8.5 billion—and the spending rate will probably rise another \$1 billion this year, and by an additional \$2 billion each in 1956 and 1957. One reason: With the Eisenhower administration's full backing a committee headed by General Clay has projected a \$25-billion, 10-year addition to the previously planned volume of interstate highway construction. The Clay proposals will be presented to the new Congress for enabling legislation. Meanwhile, spending for construction of schools, hospitals, and other public works may also be speeded up by Federal and State Government action in 1955.

Prices and wages: In 1955, for the third year running, prices and wages will change only slightly. Last year both industrial prices and living costs fluctuated within a range of less than one-half of 1 percent. Farm prices eased 2 percent, while wages rose about 2 percent. But the wage rise was more than matched by the recovery of man-hour productivity from a slump in late 1953.

Productivity this year will rise at least enough to offset the pay increases of 5 cents an hour—3.3 percent—that will probably be granted. Thus the easing pressure of costs on industrial prices will offset the upward pressure of strong demand. Farm prices will not change much this year if the weather is normal. On balance, the cost of living will again be remarkably stable.

A mild uptrend in prices may develop by the spring of 1956. That possibility, however, is contingent on a number of factors that cannot be forecast with precision—e. g., how wage increases compare with the rise in productivity, how the dip in farm output matches up against the rise in farm exports, how closely the economy approaches full employment, etc. Although it is unlikely, a combination of factors sufficient to produce a slight price rise could even take shape toward the end of 1955.

Income and savings: Last year both personal incomes and savings held within \$500 million of the peak 1953 levels. This partly reflects the influence of the economy's various built-in stabilizers, and these stabilizers will also tend to moderate the improvement in consumer spending from now on. A dip in unemployment benefits, for example, will offset part of the rise in payrolls; some of the additional payroll income, moreover, will go into taxes. During the "recession," personal incomes nearly held their own while the gross national production dropped \$14 billion; similarly, incomes will rise less sharply than gross national production in the 1955-56 upswing—\$15 billion against \$24 billion. The savings rate, which rose through 1953, declined during 1954 largely because installment debt repayments (which count as savings) eased last year. Repayments will increase gradually in 1955 and especially in 1956, however. So the savings rate, now slightly below the recent norm of 8 percent of consumer income, should rise a trifle. But the rise in savings will probably not occur until personal taxes are cut again sometime

in 1956. That cut may add as much to consumer disposable income as the \$3 billion contributed by the tax reduction on January 1, 1954, part of which went into saving and part into spending.

Consumer spending: Outlays by consumers increased \$6 billion during the "recession" year 1954 (from an annual rate \$229 billion in the fourth quarter of 1953 to \$235 billion in the last 1954 quarter). They should rise \$8 billion in 1955, and another \$5 billion in the first half of 1956. The rise in spending, moreover, will be well rounded, as suggested by Fortune's analysis of the Changing American Market. Approximately one-third of all consumer dollars will continue to be spent for services—better housing, more household utilities, medical care, car repair, etc. The rise in outlay for food, which slowed in 1954, should resume at a rate of 3 percent a year to meet population growth and satisfy the demand for more and more "built-in" services in food—precooking, prepacking, etc.

Consumer spending for goods last year was off a bit from 1953 in dollars, up a bit in physical volume of goods, buying rose 5 percent from late 1953 to late 1954, and it should rise another 5 percent by mid-1956. Nondurables will account for the bulk of the rise; apparel sales have already recovered from the warm-weather slump a year ago, and should continue to gain. Gas and oil sales are rising rapidly, and sales of most other nondurables (except tobacco) are rising steadily. As for durables, home-goods sales, led by TV, have been on the rise (despite a bad summer for air-conditioner sales). And with so much home building, appliances and furniture producers now look for bigger volume.

In 1954 Detroit sold 5,250,000 cars. That was a half million fewer cars than in 1953, but about as many as industry spokesmen had forecast, and a quarter-million more than Detroit's economists or Roundup predicted. A major reason, of course, was the early introduction of 1955 models with eye-catching innovations. Auto men now foresee still higher sales for 1955—most are predicting about 5,600,000 cars, although some project sales as high as six million. The current rise in incomes would suggest some rise in 1955 car sales; on the other hand, the industry can't look for as much sales gain from an earlier introduction of the new models—last year they were brought out almost as early as they can be. New-car sales, all in all, should about match this year's volume.

Credit: Money was plentiful and cheap in 1954 but will tighten up a little this year. Although 1955 corporate tax payments will be lower, and profits and depreciation reserves higher, the demand for bank loans to business will probably expand, instead of contracting as in 1954, because business will be increasing its inventories again. This demand for credit will probably curtail the commercial banks' ability to supply long-term funds to the capital market, although individual savings should hold up well. Meanwhile the demand for long-term funds will be heavy. Corporations may again finance a large share of their capital outlays internally but the rising trend of home construction and public works will produce a strong demand for mortgage money and necessitate more State and local bond issues.

The credit outlook, of course, depends importantly on action by the Federal Reserve, which pursued a policy of active ease in money in 1954, and now may shift gradually toward a policy of just ease. Right now there is pressure for the Federal Reserve to avoid interfering with the business recovery, but other pressures may mount for the FRB to suppress inflationary tendencies in the stock market, in inventory buying, building activity, etc. However, since the present outlook is for something less than full employment in 1955 and in 1956 (mainly because of rising productivity) the Federal Reserve

is apt to be more restrained in its overall credit control than in 1953.

All in all, interest rates will firm up. The yield on short-term obligations—Treasury bills and commercial paper—has declined more than 1 full percentage point since the hard-money pinch of 1953 (to just over 1 percent) and long-term-bond yields have dropped more than half a percentage point (to just under 3 percent). Interest rates may rise enough to make up about half these declines over the next 18 months. Relatively, however, money will remain fairly plentiful and cheap.

Exports: United States sales of civilian goods abroad rose from \$12.3 billion in 1953 to \$12.5 billion in 1954. They may rise another \$2 billion over the next 2 years, with most of the growth coming in 1956. Economic and financial recovery abroad is not only increasing the demand for United States goods, but also enabling foreign countries to relax their trade restraints against them. Meanwhile, the United States will be swelling the outflow of dollars. United States imports will increase this year and next as American industry chews up more foreign raw materials. More important, the Eisenhower administration plans a substantial increase in aid to underdeveloped countries, particularly in Asia. Only a part of this aid will be direct Government grants; the rest will come from various forms of private investment with Government collaboration—e. g., export credits, World Bank loans, Federal tax incentives or guaranties to overseas investors, etc.

Thus, whereas in recent years the United States has been buying more abroad than it sold (apart from Government gifts), an export surplus of at least \$1 billion is likely by mid-1956. United States heavy-goods exports have recently had heavy going in world markets, but with Western European industry now working at capacity, United States exports of heavy goods should increase substantially. Farm exports began to pick up in 1954, and should rise further, since Congress has authorized the disposal of \$1 billion of United States agricultural surpluses abroad to be paid for in local currencies.

THIRTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the American demand for freedom has been not for ourselves alone but for all people. Americans know that those who threaten the freedom and independence of any people are a threat to our freedom, too. We know that those who fight for freedom anywhere are fighting for our freedom as well.

This is why it gives me real pleasure, on behalf of the people of Michigan, to join in the salute to the Ukrainian people in their fight for freedom and independence.

On this 36th anniversary of the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence we recall our own dedication to human liberty and greet those who, as do the Ukrainian people, stand beside us in the fight to win it for all people everywhere. The kinship that brings us together at this time will grow even stronger as we continue the fight until independence and dignity become secure for all.

SUGGESTED POSTPONEMENT OF SALARY INCREASES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the rising Red menace in the far Pacific now threatens us with the terrible possibili-

ties of armed conflict after a short period of uneasy peace and shaky prosperity. With the United States Seventh Fleet steaming into the troubled waters of Formosa, and with the situation so grave that the President has sent to Congress a special message on this new crisis, I feel that we must reassess our budgetary situation in the light of the rapidly shifting world events.

Inflation is rearing its ugly head with all its sinister influences and implications for our economic structure. This is a time for cautious planning; it is no time for heedless spending or unwarranted tax reductions.

All Americans are vitally concerned with these related problems. They are willing to forego additional tax reductions and make necessary sacrifices to prevent further depreciation of the dollar.

Under such circumstances, it seems to me that this is no time to set a dangerous inflationary pattern by unduly increasing salaries of civilian and military personnel. We are all Americans dedicated to preserving our way of life. This preservation, however, is contingent upon stopping the inflationary spiral which will result from adding billions of dollars to our Federal budget and to the deficit. If such spending is provided, there will be economic repercussions along the line, with devastating and extremely harmful effects upon our economic system, and our national defense.

Therefore, I appeal to the President and the executive department, to Federal employees' organizations, and to my colleagues of the 84th Congress, as well, to exemplify the highest patriotic motives by postponing temporarily action on extreme demands for increased salary and wage schedules, including congressional salaries. A hastily enacted pay increase measure will be ultimately regretted by all.

It is our sworn duty and responsibility to set an example for Americans everywhere. Higher living costs have been reversed downward. This administration and the Congress should challenge the Nation to hold the economic line, not break it, at this crucial point in our history.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Charles C. Finucane, of Spokane, Wash., to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice John Slezak, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Clement Dunn, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John L. Tappin, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James A. McConnell, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James A. McConnell, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate confirmed the appointment of Mr. Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. A number of complaints were received by me from farm people in the State of Oregon regarding Mr. Peterson's views on farm parity and farm-price supports. I happen to share their disagreement with Mr. Peterson's views in this respect, and I do not believe that he is on the right track in his attitude toward farm legislation. However, I did not consider the objections to be sufficiently strong to justify any attempt to deny to the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture the right to fill this important post with a man of their choice.

I have voted for the confirmation of Mr. Ervin L. Peterson to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and I wish him success in his new office. Mr. Peterson is a longtime resident of my State of Oregon.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Routine Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Routine Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Routine Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter B. Heisel, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

SOUTHEAST ASIA COLLECTIVE DEFENSE TREATY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations voted on Friday, January 21, to report the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty to the Senate. Because of the Formosan situation, which has been the subject of much discussion and consideration dur-

ing recent days, it has not been possible to have the report completed for submission at this time. I therefore ask unanimous consent for permission to file the committee report on this treaty at a time when the Senate may not be in session.

I am confident that we shall be able to file the report sometime during the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMISSION TO STUDY THE PROBLEMS OF THE AGING AND AGED—INTRODUCTION OF BILL

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks, I should like to introduce a bill in which I am joined by more than 50 of my colleagues, calling for the establishment of a United States Commission on the Aging and Aged to explore the problems, economic and social, of this increasing number of our people.

The problems to which I shall refer are not only those with which we are presently faced, but the same problems greatly accentuated with the passing of time and the continued growth of our economy.

Since I first came to Congress, the problems of the handicapped and the disabled have interested me and have taken much of my time, and the most rewarding part of my legislative work has been the part of it which has dealt with rehabilitation.

Most of us are aware of the great waste of human resources which attends insufficient knowledge of this broad subject. Lately it has come to my attention that many studies have been carried on by numerous private and public agencies, many working independently, and others in a coordinated and united effort, to reach solutions which will be of benefit to our complex society.

Some great strides have been made as a result of this abundance of attention to the needs of the handicapped and incapacitated. Few communities in the United States have not been made aware of the need for organized responsibility in this field.

In the past year in the largest city of my State, Mr. President, certain tragic events have turned my thinking to another element of our society. That element is not composed of the chronically sick or the disabled. I have in mind the unfortunate citizens who were forced into idleness because their employers were unable to continue in business. In many instances, these individuals had spent the better part of their adult years with reasonable expectation of paid retirement, had their employers been able to continue. The plight of these individ-

uals is a sad one because they are of an age group whose productive energy is regarded as having been slackened.

There are, too, the folks who, because periodically they have sought improved opportunities, have passed up the security benefits accruing to the steadily employed. The search of these individuals for advancement and greater emolument finds them in middle life not included in the modern blueprint containing pensions. Their reemployment under current trends becomes less probable, and then only when pension arrangements are not involved. In not so ancient times this type of person was thought of as the trailblazer and the chance-taker whose courage was regarded as a virtue.

The natural inclination is for employers to hire younger men. This is true, not only because of the greater vigor of youth, but because present widespread arrangements involving insurance and pensions sometimes make it impracticable for the employer to give consideration to the older person. The latter condition could not have been avoided when these plans and formulas were established, nor can any manmade law in a free society assure the continuance in business of a private enterprise which is no longer solvent or capable of producing a return on investment.

At this point, Mr. President, I am referring only to the fiscal aspect of the situation. When dealing with problems of youth, where earning power is not at all involved, we think of many other things. Every community has its playgrounds, vocational training and education, and youth guidance centers, all thought of as preparatory. We raise and equip our children for careers as useful citizens. We overlook circumstances which may reduce one's years of useful adulthood or may result in an adulthood where a continuous place in the economy of the Nation is not properly judged as essential.

In our Nation we have, too, an ever-increasing group of citizens whose lives, because of improvement in medicine, have been prolonged. It is ironic that this improvement, which has brought about better physical health and longer lives, has created one of our most vexing problems. On every hand, we see the miracles of improved industrial and commercial methods. When these factors collide, they tend to cause new questions to arise.

It is not difficult to perceive the confusion which may result from a disorganized approach to the problem. Some of our best minds have been devoted to research on these subjects, and frequently I have heard the warning that the very large group of our troubled citizens whose anxieties are created thusly, will become prey to false prophets who may attempt to convert their fears into activities prejudicial to themselves and harmful to the Nation.

Proposals to care for the aged and to help the aging to find the means of providing for themselves must be given every encouragement. Otherwise, this movement will be taken advantage of by those whose prime concern may be the

advancement of single groups able to muster voice and pressure greater than the volume which will come from less articulate elements.

No part of our society, Mr. President, is not profoundly affected by this growing problem. To me, it is unthinkable that a Nation which boasts the best system of free enterprise in the world will stand aside while that very free enterprise is jeopardized by its inventiveness, because an important part of the system is neglected.

Steps are being taken to increase the number of our citizens entitled to old-age and survivors insurance. These are steps in the proper direction, but much more remains to be done.

In the matter of human resources, I am daily reminded of the enormous cost in knowledge and experience when our older people are shelved because they have attained an arbitrary point in life where certain actuarial agreements force total retirement from the scene. This produces a greater number of persons in the lower income bracket, and puts a drain on the national economy.

At my request, Dr. Wilma Donahue, of the University of Michigan, has gathered for me some impressive data which will be of widespread interest. Dr. Donahue is research psychologist and chairman of the division of gerontology, Institute for Human Adjustment, and lecturer in psychology at the university. She is the author of many papers on the subject, and she has collaborated in many studies which have been printed in book form. Dr. Donahue is recognized as one of the foremost authorities on this challenging economic and social problem. She has taken part in explorations into the issues involved in many States and in many nations.

Since 1900, Mr. President, the population of the United States has doubled; but the number of older people has quadrupled.

During the decade between 1940-50, the group over 65 increased by 37 percent, while the group under 65 increased by only 13 percent.

There are now more than 14 million persons 65 years of age and over in the population, or more than 8 percent; by 1970 this group will have increased to 21 million, and will include more than 12 percent of the population.

All demographic studies indicate that the growth in the older segment of the population will continue at an accelerated rate for another half century.

Every day, approximately 3,000 more people become 65 years old; but about 2,000 in the older age group die, thus making a net gain of approximately 1,000 a day, or nearly 400,000 per annum in the older age group.

In the past 13 years alone, the number of persons age 75 and over has increased almost 50 percent. Almost 4 million are now in this advanced age group. In fact, during the past decade the second fastest growing segment of the United States population has been that composed of persons 65 years of age and over.

Life expectancy at birth is steadily increasing. At the present time it is 68.4 years, a gain of 21 years since 1900.

Life expectancy of those in their later years is also increasing; at the present time the average expectancy for men at 65 is 12½ more years; and for women, 14½ more years.

The longer life span of women is creating a disproportionate number of them in the older age brackets. There are 10 women to every 9 men in the 65-and-over age group.

The median age at which wives enter widowhood is 57 years of age. In the United States, there are at present 7,500,000 widows of all ages, and at least half of these are 65 years old and over. At age 65, approximately half of the women are widows; by age 75, 72 percent of the older women have lost their husbands.

With the increasing number of older people, there is in our Nation a growing proportion of low-income families. Five million families are headed by persons 65 years of age and over. Of these, 43 percent have yearly cash incomes of less than \$1,500; 30 percent have incomes of under \$1,000; 15 percent have incomes of less than \$500.

The plight of the 2,500,000 older persons who live alone is even worse financially. Of these, 76.5 percent have incomes of less than \$1,000; nearly 40 percent have incomes of less than \$500.

Such incomes fail entirely to meet the needs of elderly people for living even at exceedingly modest levels. Official budget estimates in 1950 indicated that an elderly couple required from \$1,602 (New Orleans) to \$1,908 (Milwaukee) a year to maintain a modest, but adequate, level of living.

In spite of the improvements in social-security legislation during the last decade, and the extension of private pension plans, the financial circumstances of the older age group are still exceedingly unsatisfactory. Considerable pressure is being exerted upon employers to increase the number of employment opportunities for older people in order that they may supplement their incomes with earnings and also in order that they may have something useful to do. However, the introduction of industrial automation and the poor health of older people cast doubt upon employment as an effective solution, even if employers were to abandon present compulsory retirement and age discriminatory hiring practices.

In a recent survey, it was found that 42 percent of all men 65 and older were still in the labor force, but that of those who were not in the labor force only 6 percent felt well enough to want part-time or full-time jobs. The great majority of older men who were not in the labor force reported that they were not well enough to work. It was concluded that these findings represent the hard core of the economic problem of the aged and that—

The various devices which have been suggested for persuading employers to retain older workers do not * * * touch the heart of the problem. The problem is not one of a great reservoir of wasted resources but of men whose working lives are in a very real sense over.

The implications are clear. The physical and financial limitations of large

numbers of older people make it impossible for them to meet their needs without the assistance of national, State, and local government and voluntary groups. Special services and facilities are needed to increase financial resources, to provide more healthful living circumstances, and to create useful roles for the aging. Medical care, housing, income maintenance, employment, and effective use of leisure time are special areas needing consideration and action.

There is still great need for expansion of medical care facilities. Chronic illness is 5 times more prevalent at age 65 and over than at younger ages. It should be our goal to offer a constellation of services integrated to provide each individual the type of care he needs at a cost within his means to pay and embodying the best practices of medicine and rehabilitation. The acts of the last Congress providing funds and enabling legislation to help communities establish hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers and services should go far in providing urgently needed facilities.

In addition to increased health facilities, Mr. President, there is need for an extension of health insurance for the older age group. Not more than 26 percent of persons 65 years and over, and only 15 percent aged 75 and above, have hospitalization insurance; even smaller percentages carry medical and surgical insurance. Most of the aged do not have health insurance because (a) they cannot afford to pay the premiums, (b) they are largely unemployed and most low cost insurance has been issued to employed groups, and (c) they are excluded from coverage by many companies or are entitled only to limited benefits.

In a 1950 survey, it was shown that 1 out of 7 couples receiving old-age and survivors insurance had 1 or more members hospitalized during the year; of these 65 percent incurred medical expenses of \$200 or more, an amount which depleted family savings in more than half the cases.

Inability to maintain health insurance causes many old people to neglect chronic illness; some obtain medical care only by sacrificing other essentials to healthful living; others resort to care whose cost is borne by younger and middle-aged groups, either as family members or taxpayers at large. It would be cheaper for communities to help provide health insurance than to pay for expensive medical care for old people prone to long-term illnesses.

Ancillary services needed to promote the health of older people include house-keeping, bedside nursing, hot meals, visiting and shopping, home-care medical programs for convalescents, clinics for adults who are well, activities and crafts centers, special employment programs for disabled and frail old people wishing to work, market outlets for crafted goods, and recreational programs.

Mr. President, housing is one of the most pressing needs of the older group. Of the 65-and-over group, 69 percent live in households maintained by themselves, 26 percent live in households of other persons, and 6 percent live in institutions, hotels, or large rooming houses.

Home ownership is high. Approximately two-thirds of all families whose heads are 65 and over own their homes. On an average, however, older people are overhoused and occupy low value structures which are dilapidated and substandard in heating, cooking, lighting, and plumbing facilities. For these poor accommodations, renters often pay a disproportionate amount of their incomes for rent. Twenty-six percent of older families who live in rental units pay 30 percent or more of their incomes for rent. Homeowners find that their property continually depreciates and that they are not able to keep it in repair because of physical and financial reasons.

Older people need low-rental housing especially designed to meet their special limitations and needs. Federally financed public housing has not been generally available to them because the law states that such housing may be used only for family occupancy. Administrators, knowing that one member of an older couple may die soon, have been unwilling to accept older families. State financed public housing in New York has set aside 5 percent of all new housing for individuals 65 years and over, without reference to their family status. Boston, Chicago, and Cleveland have special housing projects designed for older people. Efforts of these kinds are so limited, however, that they do not begin to meet the need.

Massachusetts recently established a loan fund of \$15,000,000, which is available to local housing authorities to build low-rental housing for the low-income group aged 65 and over. Already 23 communities have provided plans and have applied for these funds.

Extension of State programs and assistance at the Federal level are much needed. Private enterprise does not find it profitable to build for a group able to pay only a very low rental fee. Lending agencies will not extend credit to older people even when they can offer reasonable security. Furthermore, lending agencies are unwilling to loan money to nonprofit organizations on a long-term amortization basis. FHA financing has been limited to individuals less than 65 years of age, thus making it impossible for older people to build retirement homes for themselves.

Canada has enacted legislation to make it possible for local communities with 10 percent of the cost of a housing project on hand to receive an outright gift from the Government of one-third of the cost, and to borrow the remainder from the Government Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

In England and the Scandinavian countries government and local communities furnish the necessary financial assistance to provide housing for most of the low-income elderly group.

All communities and countries have found that when old people are housed in safe, decent, sanitary, comfortable, specially designed housing their health has improved and they are much happier. It has also been found that it is much cheaper to provide housing than to care for the old people in hospitals, sanitariums, or other institutions.

Although the improvements in social-security legislation enacted during the past session of Congress will include many more people in the program and will increase the benefits being received, most old people will still have only very limited incomes from this source. As of October 1954, the average OASI payment was \$58.87; the recent changes in the law will increase average monthly payments from \$5 to \$13.

Likewise, individuals dependent upon old-age assistance are forced to live at bare subsistence levels. The average monthly payment for OAA recipients as of October 1954 was only \$51.53 a month.

In old age, nonearned income, including pension benefits, savings, insurance, and so forth, usually becomes the only—and it is inadequate—source of support. For example, in a recent survey, it was shown that almost half, 47.2 percent, of males and 81 percent of females aged 65 and over having nonearned income earned nothing in addition. The median nonearned income for older men was only \$1,008, and for older women it was \$536.

Consideration should be given to the further extension of social-security coverage, to the maximum increase of benefits compatible with sound economic planning, and to an increase in the amount permitted to be earned while receiving benefits. Vigorous programs of saving including home ownership, insurance, pensions, investment, and so forth, should be advocated in order to increase the average amount of nonearned income in the later years.

It has already been noted, Mr. President, that employment cannot be expected to solve the financial problems of large numbers of older people. However, every effort should be made to enable and encourage those able and wanting to work to find jobs.

Federal subsidization to communities interested in establishing special employment projects for the elderly might be investigated. These projects can be worked out in cooperation with management and unions, and thus cause no conflict with existing policies. Examples are already available. In Boston a group of businessmen established Sunset Industries to employ retired men and women. In Holly Hill, Fla., a retired businessman established a factory to reproduce early American furniture, which employs only retired men. In Hempstead and Schenectady, N. Y., older people have formed groups to sell their own and each other's services to established firms. The number of these projects is far too small. Moreover, they are not likely to be duplicated to any extent until funds are made available on a grant-in-aid basis to communities wishing to develop these and similar projects.

Current practices in the hiring and retiring of older workers need considerable more study and evaluation. Likewise, the reasons which are usually given as a basis for current practices, including increased health-insurance costs, difficulties encountered in fitting an older worker into a retirement program, and so forth, should be thoroughly investigated.

It has been apparent from the figures and facts already presented that the United States has a rapidly growing population of the aging who are largely unemployable and who have unlimited amounts of leisure time. What lies ahead for these older people is one of the most important questions facing American society at the present time.

Current trends show that colonies of old people are beginning to form in the more benign climates of Florida, California, and the Southwest. For example, in 1 Florida community there are 3,000 retired families in an isolated area. This community of retirees provides no facilities for socialization or for service activities in the town; the only organized group is a garden club. In many retirement towns in Florida, almost one-fourth of the homes have for-sale signs on them. Students of this phenomenon indicate that it reflects boredom and dissatisfaction which come from having nothing to do. Aggregations of people who are dissatisfied and who at the same time are having to live in minimum circumstances constitute potential trouble spots in our society; and, sooner or later, organizations may form which operate only for the vested interests of the old-age group.

Until these facts are dealt with as an entity, putting all the bases together in an overall pattern, our efforts in human engineering will be less than skillful.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. POTTER. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The able Senator from Michigan mentioned Florida, and referred to the many retired people who live in that State. I am very happy to be a cosponsor of the bill to make a study of the question, and I support in every way the remarks the Senator from Michigan is making.

It is true that many retired people live in Florida, and it is also true there is every indication that the number will increase. Obviously, people like to come to Florida to live when they qualify under the various retirement programs in their home States. We are grateful that these people can take advantage of such programs, and that many of them who reach retirement age move to Florida.

However, it is necessary to make a further study of the problem in an effort to find the solution. In my State 15 percent of the total population is 65 years of age and over. Furthermore, we have the problem of employment, because many of the retired people would like to supplement their retirement income through employment. It is very difficult for them to obtain employment in many cases, because industry, unfortunately, does not wish to employ any person who is over 65 years of age. That is a mistaken policy in many ways.

I believe the Senator from Michigan is making a most commendable approach to an important subject, and we in Florida appreciate the efforts he is making to solve this difficult problem. I am certainly very happy to be associated with him and with the bill which I understand he is about to introduce.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his kind comments. It is probably true that problems connected with the aged are coming to the fore in Florida more than in any other State. I know that in my own State of Michigan many of our people, in later life, when they reach retirement age, seek the climate of Florida, and possibly also of California and the Southwest, because cold weather is not the most pleasant climate for aging people.

At the same time, many problems arise. The studies I have mentioned, as the distinguished Senator from Florida well knows, are directed toward the solution of those problems. Some communities in Florida are inhabited by elderly people of practically about the same age. That fact itself brings about certain abnormal situations. The purpose of establishing the commission is to study the various problems with which aged people are confronted, and with which the communities in which they live are also confronted. I believe what we advocate is a step in the right direction. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for being a cosponsor of the bill. I sincerely hope that we will be able to get early action on the proposed legislation.

The Government of the United States, Mr. President, must delay no longer in giving its sanction and support for the collection of all available evidence. Even the term aged needs a redefinition, so that we may better apply ourselves to the task. It is one of the most important problems we face as a Nation. It should command the use of every facility for advancement, to the end that we may help in providing the remedies concurrently with our other improvements.

Let us explore this social phenomenon and try to learn how it will manifest itself in the years to come. One of the principal riddles of the subject is how it will affect the economy of the Nation. The project I urge should be able to draw from our private industries and those concerned with their survival some of the clues which may very well avert cumulative destructive trends.

Interest has manifested itself in many places and will increase. I share the concern of those who have devoted long hours of study to the subject that the very diffusion of these efforts may fail to achieve full application unless that which is already known is more broadly applied.

Much can be accomplished if a central collection point or repository is established. Several agencies of the Government have already amassed much information and have given leadership to the many matters related to this subject. It may very well be that such an approach as that which I propose can correlate these efforts.

I am sure that there is an obligation on the part of our Government to address itself to all characteristics of this social and economic phenomenon. In whatever we discover to be needed, I am sure that it will be the objective of all of us to avoid paternalism so that the

dignity of the individual shall be maintained in any future pattern. We cannot, in good conscience, ignore these trends, nor can we pretend they do not exist. Our civilization was brought about by courageous men and women willing to recognize the duties of community living and eager to make it possible for all to have a chance for happiness to the end of their days.

Mr. President, from our institutions of higher learning, our industries, our trade and professional associations, our labor organizations, our learned societies and from any and all groups sharing the common burden of shaping the future of our country, we should recruit assistance. I propose that the Congress establish a commission to tackle this job.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the junior Senator from

Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill proposing establishment of a United States Commission on the Aging and Aged. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this measure be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the many colleagues who have joined with me in the introduction of this bill. They have joined without reservation, with the exception of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who had a question regarding one provision of the bill concerning the powers of the Commission with reference to calling witnesses. I might state for the benefit of my colleagues that the bill is patterned after the bill which created the so-called Hoover Commission. I have no particular pride in any of the sections, but I assume that the committee which will have jurisdiction of the proposed legislation will give consideration to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 693) for the establishment of the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged, introduced by Mr. POTTER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress recognizes that an increasingly large proportion of our population consists of persons past middle age. It is the sense of the Congress that the implications of this fact require further study and investigation from the standpoint of the national economy and the general welfare. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, in recognition of this fact, to assist in defining the problems of the aging and aged segment of the population, and in finding solutions therefor, by providing for an immediate study leading to recommendations for integrated action particularly with respect to:

- (a) Employment and employability,
- (b) Income maintenance,
- (c) Health and physical care,
- (d) Housing, living arrangements, and family relationship, and
- (e) Effective use of leisure time.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON THE AGING AND AGED

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Commission on the Aging and Aged (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert, on a part-time or full-time basis,

with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18, of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 10 members as follows:

- (1) Six appointed by the President of the United States, 3 from the executive branch of the Government and 3 from private life;
- (2) Two appointed by the President of the Senate from the Senate; and
- (3) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the House of Representatives.

(b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study, investigate, analyze, and assess existing knowledge and programs related to the problems of the aging and the aged in this country, in accordance with the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, with a view to determining what steps can be taken to provide a better integration of this

group in the social and economic life of the Nation. In carrying out its functions, the Commission shall solicit the cooperation and help of the various professional, business, and labor groups, as well as all other groups which are concerned with the problem, for the purpose of obtaining their views, experience, and assistance in providing direction for future planning and such legislative action as may be necessary. The Commission shall further make full use of the information, studies, and experience of the various agencies of the Government which have considered various aspects of the problem.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit an interim report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress not later than December 31, 1955, and the Commission may submit such earlier interim reports as it deems advisable. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. The Commission shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1956. The Commission shall cease to exist 30 days after the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(c) Other data: The Commission shall cooperate with State and local bodies, and other public and private bodies, to obtain information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act.

THE FORMOSA SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it goes without saying that this body will cooperate unreservedly with the President in any matter vital to the security and welfare of the Nation. Perhaps that is what is involved in the joint resolution which has been introduced today by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] for himself and other Senators. If so, then the President can rest assured that he shall have the full support of the Senate.

I must say, however, that at this point I am concerned by the manner in which this matter has been presented to the

Senate. At the beginning of a new week, after a series of hurried conferences, leaks, and rumors, the Senate is confronted with a highly unusual resolution, with the implication that immediate action is essential.

If there is an impending crisis, why did not the President come in person to present the facts to the Congress? Why was the Senate not advised sooner? Crises in foreign relations are not like typhoons in the Formosan Straits. They do not arise overnight. They give full warning, or should give it, through the numerous channels of information available to the executive branch—provided, of course, that those channels are functioning properly.

The situation in the vicinity of Formosa is not one which lends itself to improvisation. We have slipped into a difficult position there. It will grow more difficult unless this Government acts with a high degree of responsibility.

This resolution comes to us on the heels of the proposed treaty of mutual defense with the Republic of China. Since early in January, the Foreign Relations Committee has had that treaty under consideration. As the Senate knows, both the treaty and the resolution cover substantially the same ground. Both deal with the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores in roughly comparable terms.

I do not understand, therefore, precisely why the President has seen fit to seek passage by Congress of the joint resolution which has been introduced today. If it were purely a matter of urgency, he could have asked the Senate to handle the treaty in that fashion. The fact is that members of the Foreign Relations Committee were advised by the executive branch to deal with the treaty in the normal order of business.

I stated at the outset my belief that the Senate would never deny cooperation to the President in any matter affecting the vital interests of the Nation. That belief applies in this case as in any other involving foreign relations.

As a coequal branch of the Government of the United States, however, Congress has a sworn obligation to examine this resolution, as it would any similar resolution, in an independent light. We cannot abdicate our constitutional responsibilities any more than the President can assign his to us.

Before we begin the examination, it seems to me to be of the utmost importance that we bear in mind the historical circumstances surrounding the Formosa situation. Sound policy must be based on these circumstances as seen from the perspective of the vital interests of this Nation.

Prior to World War II, Formosa was a part of the Japanese Empire. That status was generally accepted by the nations of the world, including the United States. Many Chinese, however, continued to regard the island as a part of China which, under duress, their country had been forced to cede to Japan towards the close of the 19th century. China's claim is based on the contention that Formosa had been under the nominal control of Peking for centuries, and on the fact that in the present day most

of the inhabitants are of Chinese origin.

It was from Formosa that the Japanese militarists launched some of the most devastating naval and air attacks against our forces in the Pacific during World War II. Our vital interest in Formosa then was obvious; it was to deny the island, insofar as it was in our power to do so, to any group or nation which would use it for aggressive purposes in the western Pacific. That vital interest explains the American signature to the Cairo Declaration of 1943. Under the terms of the agreement, the return of Formosa and the Pescadores to the Republic of China was pledged by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Generalissimo of China. The Cairo Declaration was a pledge, not a treaty. It did not, under international law, transfer title of the islands to China. They remained technically under the sovereignty of Japan, at least until the end of World War II.

We did not have at the time of the Cairo Declaration any interest in the acquisition of Formosa for ourselves. As a matter of fact, once American sea and air power had made possible the occupation of the island by the Chinese Nationalist Government at the end of World War II, we immediately reduced our military commitment in that area. In the hands of the Republic of China, Formosa no longer constituted a threat of aggression to us from the Far East. Our vital interest was secured, pending a peace treaty with Japan.

I shall not review at this time the tragic events which completely unhinged the postwar situation in the Far East. It is sufficient to point out only that China was torn asunder by revolution and by the intrusion of aggressive communism from northern Asia. In the incredible chaos that accompanied those developments, the only alternative to throwing ourselves into the flames of war on the Asian mainland was to await a clarification of the situation.

The status of Formosa and our policies with respect to it did not change until international communism moved out of its Russian and Chinese orbit in Asia and fired the conflict in Korea. Largely as a result of our initiative, the United States was immediately designated by the United Nations to command a collective military action to turn back the Communist aggression.

As a corollary of that United Nations action and the responsibilities which we assumed in connection with it, our commitment in Formosa deepened. The President, the Secretary of State, and the President's military commanders found it necessary to neutralize the situation in the vicinity of Formosa if the conflict in Korea was not to flare into a general war in the Far East. Our interest in Formosa, however, remained the same. We had no interest in acquiring Formosa for ourselves but only in preventing it from falling into the hands of the Communist aggressors. We supplied the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa with military and economic aid, while the 7th Fleet was ordered to patrol the straits. They prevented an attack on the island, and

brought to an end the sporadic and futile air raids against the Chinese coastal cities.

We had to proceed in these circumstances to negotiate a peace treaty with Japan. By the terms of that treaty, Japan renounced all claims to Formosa. We and the other nations involved insisted on that renunciation as a safeguard against renewal of aggression from that source. The treaty, however, left indeterminate the legal status of the island, pending a clarification of the situation in the Far East. In actuality, Formosa remained under the control of the Nationalist Government of China.

The decision to neutralize the Formosan Straits in 1950 involved great risks. President Truman accepted those risks courageously as a part of the responsibility of his office. As events subsequently showed, he had made the proper decision. Not a single American was lost in combat in the Formosan area. Yet, the island was kept out of the hands of the Communists. The position of the Nationalist Government of China grew stronger, not weaker, as a result of it. The interests of this country, the United Nations, and world peace were served by the decision. When the Chinese people are free to understand the facts, I believe they will also realize that it served their long-range interests as well.

There may yet be a way to avoid the drift toward the abyss in the Far East. We will not avoid it, however, unless the futility and the danger to this country of loud words and little actions is now fully understood. We will not avoid it unless we keep before us the nature of our real national interests in the Formosan region.

Armed Forces of the United States are in that region for one purpose. They are there, or should be there, only to prevent Formosa and the Pescadores from falling into the hands of forces of Communist aggression which might ultimately be aimed at this country. It is essential that that purpose be understood and adhered to by every combatant, from private to general, and from seaman to admiral, who is involved in any way in the operation. Within that general scope of policy, it may be necessary to make dangerous operational decisions; but only the executive branch has the innumerable facts on which to base those decisions. Hundreds of its employees are engaged in no other function than in collecting and analyzing such facts. The Senate does not have the facts. The House of Representatives does not have them. The American people certainly do not have them. The responsibility for the day-to-day decisions rests with the President and his branch of the Government. Resolutions to the contrary, he cannot share it.

Our national policies with respect to Korea have an international corollary, and it is time to take it into consideration. The depth of our involvement in Formosa has developed in part out of the international action in Korea. It is time to make clear to the Chinese Communists and to other nations with interests in Asia that the Korean and the Formosan problems are inextricably tied together.

If there is to be hope for a stable peace in the Far East, it is essential that there must first be a termination of the incipient threat of large-scale hostilities between the Chinese forces on Formosa and those on the mainland. What is needed in the Formosan vicinity is what has already been achieved in Korea—a cease-fire arranged under the United Nations—and one which I am happy to report was included in the President's message today.

It seems to me urgent, therefore, that the President consider taking the Formosan question immediately to the Security Council. If that body cannot act because some nation may choose to block peace by the exercise of the veto, then the issue perhaps may be carried to the General Assembly. It is not unreasonable to expect that the nations which supported the action against aggression in Korea will recognize the relationship between the Korean and Formosan situations. Nor is it unreasonable to expect that any nation which sincerely desires peace will be unwilling to share the responsibility for maintaining it in the Far East.

If a firm cease-fire can be achieved in the vicinity of Formosa, it might serve as the prelude to a general political solution of the many problems which for a decade have plagued the peoples of Asia and this country with conflict, and the threat of still greater conflict. From our point of view, such a settlement must be based on the following principles, which are, for the most part, traditional and well-tried principles, and can provide the basis for firm and effective action for peace:

First. We make no territorial claims to Formosa, the Pescadores or any adjacent islands currently in dispute.

Second. We affirm the terms of the Japanese Peace Treaty, under which Japan has relinquished all claims to Formosa.

Third. We have one overriding interest with respect to any settlement affecting Formosa: that the island does not become a springboard for aggression in the Western Pacific.

Fourth. The final legal status of Formosa and the Pescadores should be in accord with the freely expressed desires of the inhabitants of the islands.

Mr. President, if I may return to the joint resolution for a moment before concluding my remarks, I wish to say only that I do not believe the Senate should act in haste in this matter. The full implications of the resolution, to say the least, are not clear. Certainly, it ought not to be considered except in conjunction with the pending treaty between this country and the Republic of China.

I am sure that it is not the intent of the President, by his message, to ask Congress to give him in advance our constitutional power to declare war. Yet, such an inference might easily be drawn from it. By the same token, I can hardly believe that he is asking Congress to assume the powers of his office to conduct the foreign relations of this country and to command the Armed Forces.

The Constitution wisely provides for the separate responsibilities of the various branches. Each has the facilities and composition which make possible the discharge of those responsibilities.

As Executive, the President, and the President alone, is equipped to make the operating decisions relative to our foreign relations and our Armed Forces. Conversely, the President cannot declare war. War cannot be declared without inviting the destruction of the Nation until it is evident through Congress that the will of the people of this country is fully mobilized.

I know that the Foreign Relations Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished President pro tempore [Mr. GEORGE], will explore fully the constitutional questions, along with other implications in the joint resolution, before the Senate is asked to deal with it. I am also glad to note that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] will likewise join in and give us the benefit of his wisdom.

Mr. President, I am looking forward to the meeting of the two committees this afternoon, and I hope that the words which I have spoken today will be given some consideration, because it is my firm belief that we are taking a step which is fraught with grave consequences, that we should know where we are going, and that we should take our time in discussing the joint resolution, and be absolutely sure of the facts before we finally act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was very pleased to hear the Senator from Montana say that he saw no need for immediate action. Is it not the Senator's understanding that the President, under his constitutional powers, already has the power to meet any emergency or to resist any sudden attack which might constitute an emergency?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and I think most, if not all, constitutional authorities would so hold.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not trying to leave the implication that the joint resolution may not be justified. That is for the Senate to determine, after consideration, and I think the President is motivated by a desire to have consultation and to preserve the usual comity. However, the point I make is that there is no need for immediate action. Under the circumstances, it seems to me, there is plenty of reason for the Senate to take its time and for giving the country time to understand the significance of the problem, before we vote on the question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. All the implications should be considered. I do not think the joint resolution should be rushed to passage today, and I am delighted that there

will be consideration of the measure by the two committees acting jointly. However, there can be read into the message many things that are not so limited as they seem to be. I have no doubt that the President's intent is honorable, and that he is determined to achieve a reasonable, sound, and honorable peace; but I think we owe it to ourselves, as representatives of the people, to go into the joint resolution and the message as thoroughly as possible, before we take action.

If I may continue for a moment, I think it is in the national interest to defend and protect Formosa and the Pescadores, and the present Nationalist Government thereof. No nation has title to the Pescadores and Formosa at the present time, because there has been no conveyance of title to that land since the end of the Second World War, at which time the Japanese renounced their claim to that particular territory. So we have as much right now to declare what the future of these islands shall be as do our allies. In our hands collectively lies the final authority to determine what shall be the final disposition of the Pescadores and Formosa; and I think those two areas are interdependent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Montana for his fine remarks, and I think they clarify the situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I understand that the reason the Senator from Montana says there is no need for immediate action is that the President already has a right to act if he deems it necessary to do so. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President does have such authority under the Constitution, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the Nation. Furthermore, we have had before us, as the President points out in his message of today, a treaty of mutual security between the United States and the Republic of China. We have been informed there is no hurry to have the treaty ratified. So, Mr. President, if there is no hurry to have action taken on the treaty, why is there such a hurry to have action taken on the joint resolution, which in effect covers somewhat the same areas?

However, it occurs to me that those who read the message will have raised in their minds some questions as to exactly what is meant; and I believe we should explore this matter fully, and should know what we are doing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am satisfied that the Senator from Montana agrees with me that it is nice of the President to keep us informed concerning these matters and, if possible, to let us know about similar matters in the future. Certainly we should know all the facts, when we pass upon a question of this kind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. In my opinion, the President is to be congratulated and thanked for taking us into his trust in the case of this particular matter, and I say that very seriously. On the other hand, I believe we must also keep in mind that there is a separation of authority as between the execu-

tive and the legislative branches of our Government, and that under the Constitution there are certain elements of responsibility which are his, first of all, because he is President; and, second, because, as President, he is Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the action of the President of the United States, in sending to the Congress the message to which reference has been made—and I hold the message in my hand, and I also have before me a copy of the joint resolution regarding the Formosa matter, which is to be considered by the Congress—is the most encouraging thing which has happened in my approximately 11 years in the United States Senate. I compliment and congratulate the President of the United States. He is doing exactly what many of us have been urging for many, many years that a President do, namely, share the responsibility for wars with the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the right to declare war. I think it is a splendid thing. I congratulate the President, and I hope this action on his part will establish a pattern which all future Presidents will follow.

The President has reached the conclusion that the situation in the Formosan area is serious. Having reached that conclusion, he has now requested the Congress for its advice and consent, if you please, under the authority reposed in Congress by the Constitution.

However, I think the Congress should take sufficient time—and I do not mean that any delaying tactics should be engaged in—to check into the entire matter. That should be done by both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and both branches of the Congress. Certainly it is important that they take a reasonable length of time to do so.

I believe we are entitled to have before us the facts upon which the President based his decision to send the message to Congress. I do not believe we should be hurried into taking action on this matter. I hasten to state that I do not mean there should be a delay of a week, 10 days, or 2 weeks. Instead, I am thinking in terms of a few days. It seems to me it is important that we be given a few days to acquaint ourselves with the situation and to see whether we can absorb as many of the facts regarding the circumstances and conditions as the President did in arriving at the decision to send the message to the Congress, because he based his decision upon certain facts and circumstances, and we should be given sufficient time to do the same thing.

We ought not to delay. We ought to make this subject the first order of business, but we ought to obtain the facts. I am certain that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are most desirous that we obtain all the facts. I am sure that they will give to the Congress all the facts and all the information they have. I am confident that they are just as eager as we are that sufficient time be taken to reach a wise decision on this question.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Indiana has expressed the hope that this subject will be gone into thoroughly by the joint action of the two committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. I express to him the belief that, inasmuch as he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which, with the Committee on Armed Services, will consider this subject jointly this afternoon, and at such other times as may be necessary in order to obtain all the facts, he will insist upon all the facts being obtained, so that when we come to take action on the resolution, or any comparable proposal which may be before the Congress, we will be in possession of the necessary information.

I am glad to hear the Senator make the observation which he has made. I have confidence that he, as one of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will endeavor to obtain the necessary information for other Members of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel that our case would be much stronger, and there would be a greater degree of unity and cooperation as between the Congress and the American people if we were to take a reasonable length of time to obtain the facts. Then we should be acting upon the basis of facts, rather than merely because the President of the United States sent a message to Congress upon which we acted within an hour or two. If we take the time to obtain the facts, then we can say, "Mr. President, this is what we want you to do." The world and the American people ought to be 100-percent satisfied that we are doing the right thing, and the thing which is necessary. If we take the time to obtain the facts, our action will then be based upon facts, and not merely upon 2 or 3 hours of hearings before the 2 committees acting jointly, followed by brief debate in the Senate. If we obtain the facts, we can say to the world, "The President considered this subject carefully. The Secretary of State considered it carefully, and the Congress of the United States did not act within 2 or 3 hours, but considered the subject for several days and obtained all the facts. Upon the basis of the facts the Congress came to the same conclusion as did the President and the Secretary of State."

Mr. CLEMENTS. My observation is made only for the purpose of commending my friend from Indiana and expressing confidence that he will obtain the facts.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure that the President of the United States is just as eager to furnish the facts as we are to obtain them. I congratulate the President of the United States for sharing the responsibility with the Congress. If the Congress takes a reasonably sufficient time to study and assimilate the facts, we shall then have inaugurated a new era in United States foreign policy.

I rose to congratulate the President for the way in which he has handled this subject. I hope the Congress will consider it with due deliberation, with a

view to obtaining all the facts. I do not advocate any delaying tactics. I ask only for a reasonable length of time in which to obtain and consider the facts. Then when we reach a decision, our decision will be worth something, because it will be based upon facts and not hysteria. We shall not be doing something on the spur of the moment.

OPPOSITION TO CLOSING OF UNITED STATES POST OFFICES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on January 6, the second day of Congress, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, which sets forth that it is the sense of the Congress that the Postmaster General should not discontinue any United States post office until the expiration of 60 days after he shall have reported to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and House of Representatives on the necessity and advisability of such action.

I, like many other Senators and Representatives, have been deluged with complaints about the Post Office Department's action in closing many small post offices throughout the country.

On January 14 I sent to the Postmaster General a telegram strongly urging that he postpone action to close a fourth-class post office at White Rock, S. C. This is only one of many complaints I have registered with the Postmaster General about this action. More than 200 citizens in the area of White Rock, S. C., sent to the Postmaster General a petition requesting that this office not be closed. Mr. President, up to now I have been unsuccessful in receiving any consideration from the Post Office Department concerning these complaints.

A few moments ago, in glancing at the news ticker, I read the following statement:

WASHINGTON.—The Post Office Department changed its mind today and decided to keep the Peoli, Ohio, post office open as a favor to Denton "Cy" Young, one of baseball's all-time pitching greats.

Originally the Department was going to shut down the tiny post office as a money-losing proposition and establish a star route. About 11 families and Young get their mail there.

Young is the 87-year-old ex-Cleveland, Boston, and St. Louis pitcher whose record of 511 major league victories in 23 years still stands. He was understood through friends to be complaining about the closing.

So W. R. Fudge, the Post Office's regional operations manager in Cincinnati, wrote to Representative Bow, Republican, of Ohio, Young's Congressman: "In view of your interest and in view of the large amount of mail that Mr. Cy Young receives through the post office, no further action will be taken at this time."

Commented Bow: "This is the kind of thing that makes America great."

Peoli, with a population of 30, is in Tuscarawas County, in the middle belt of Ohio on the eastern side.

Mr. President, I certainly have no argument over the fact that "Cy" Young was a great baseball player. I have no argument over the fact that the Post Office Department has decided not to close this office, but to keep it as a monument to the great "Cy" Young. But, Mr. President, the Postmaster General has

said heretofore that he had to close these offices in order to save money, because most of them were losing money. I hope this announcement means a change of mind by the Post Office Department, and that hereafter the Postmaster General will give serious consideration to my requests that he not close offices in my State.

We have many great people in South Carolina, but I am not here requesting that the Government establish monuments to greatness in my State. Rather, my request is that serious consideration be given to maintaining the present offices because of necessity.

To name only a few, I have reference to Wateree, White Rock, Ballantine, and Lykesland, S. C.; and in my State there are many others in connection with which the Postmaster General is already aware of my interest and the interest of the people of South Carolina.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two committees which were authorized to meet jointly this afternoon during the session of the Senate, namely, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, be authorized to file a joint report at any time the Senate is in recess or in adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 26, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 24, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Charles C. Finucane, of the State of Washington, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice John Slezak, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, January 24, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

James Clement Dunn, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

John L. Tappin, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Kingdom of Libya.

James C. H. Bonbright, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment to the titles indicated:

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Belton O'Neal Bryan, of South Carolina.

J. Robert Fluker, of Kansas.

Harold G. Kissick, of Maryland.

Leonard H. Price, of Virginia.

Louis F. Thompson, of Indiana.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

James S. Beddie, of Maryland.

William L. Hamilton, Jr., of Maryland.

Charles N. Manning, of Virginia.

Norman M. Pearson, of Maryland.

Charles F. Pick, Jr., of Virginia.

George M. Pollard, of Virginia.

Joseph Rosa, of Wisconsin.

Ancel N. Taylor, of Idaho.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

William E. Beauchamp, Jr., of California.

Robert L. Brown, of New Jersey.

Darwin J. DeGolia, of Maryland.

Paul W. Deibel, of Ohio.

Miss Selma G. Freedman, of the District of Columbia.

John K. Havemeyer, of Illinois.

T. Greig Henderson, of the District of Columbia.

John J. Janke, of Ohio.

Miss Elizabeth Jorkick, of the District of Columbia.

Northrop H. Kirk, of California.

Duncan A. D. Mackay, of New Jersey.

John B. Penfold, of Missouri.

Richard B. Peters, of Oklahoma.

Hilding A. Peterson, of Minnesota.

James A. Ramsey, of Massachusetts.

Robert L. Redding, of Florida.

Miss Genevieve F. Rifley, of Nebraska.

Melvin E. Sinn, of Virginia.

Horace L. Talley, of Virginia.

Niemann A. Terry, Jr., of South Carolina.

John C. Thornburg, of Maryland.

Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.

Miss A. Dorothea Wool, of Maryland.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Miss Alma M. Armstrong, of Maine.

Howard J. Ashford, Jr., of Colorado.

James H. Ashida, of Washington.

Herbert Corkran, Jr., of Virginia.

Miss Mary G. Crain, of Maryland.

Miss Lois M. Day, of Ohio.

Miss Hazel C. Dougherty, of Pennsylvania.

Miss Eleanor Ebert, of Pennsylvania.

Arne T. Fliflet, of South Carolina.

Miss Helen F. Foose, of California.

Miss Anna G. Foster, of Texas.

Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.

Lawrence J. Kennon, of California.

Mrs. Elvira P. Martin, of Connecticut.

Miss Annee W. Meriam, of Massachusetts.

George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.

Miss Charlotte M. Morehouse, of Virginia.

Peter J. Raineri, of New York.

Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., of Massachusetts.

Miss Harriet C. Thurgood, of Florida.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Richard W. Boehm, of New York.

Richard J. Brynildsen, of California.

Miss Pamela F. Craig, of Pennsylvania.

Daniel H. Daniels, of Virginia.

John R. Davis, Jr., of California.

Donald B. Easum, of Wisconsin.

Louis P. Goetz III, of Pennsylvania.

Lewis D. Junior, of Missouri.

Richard G. Long, of Illinois.

Charles N. Rassias, of Massachusetts.

William F. Ryan, of New York.

Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

James A. McConnell, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Ervin L. Peterson, of Oregon, to be a member of the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION DIRECTOR

Joseph F. Finnegan, of New York, to be Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Walter B. Heisel, of Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this new day, affording and challenging us with many opportunities to serve our generation and minister to the needs of humanity.

Grant that we may not be recreant to any duty or afraid to raise our voices and take our stand on the side of those programs of legislation which are just and righteous.

Show us how we may have a large and vital part in helping our beloved country to be true to its highest potential and its God-ordained destiny.

We beseech Thee that in our hopes and longings to build the way of amity and comity among all mankind, we may see how imperative it is to remove the roadblocks of pride and prejudice of selfishness and personal aggrandizement.

Inspire us with a greater loyalty to the principle of reverence for the sanctity and worth of human personality and human dignity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 20, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution favoring temporary permission for parking on square 723 of the Capitol grounds.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider a report from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause 21, rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit while the House is in session today, and that we may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SAFEGUARDING THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 76)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The most important objective of our Nation's foreign policy is to safeguard the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable peace. In the Western Pacific, a situation is developing in the Formosa Straits that seriously imperils the peace and our security.

Since the end of Japanese hostilities in 1945, Formosa and the Pescadores have been in the friendly hands of our loyal ally, the Republic of China. We have recognized that it was important that these islands should remain in friendly hands. In unfriendly hands Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance of morale, economic, and military forces upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes, for the United States and other free nations, the geographical backbone of their security structure in that ocean. In addition, this breach would interrupt north-south communications between other important elements of that barrier, and damage the economic life of countries friendly to us.

The United States and the friendly government of the Republic of China, and indeed all the free nations, have a common interest that Formosa and the Pescadores should not fall into the control of aggressive Communist forces.

Influenced by such considerations, our Government was prompt, when the Communists committed armed aggression in Korea in June 1950, to direct our 7th Fleet to defend Formosa from possible invasion from the Communist mainland.

These considerations are still valid. The 7th Fleet continues under Presidential directive to carry out that defensive mission. We also provide military and economic support to the Chinese Nationalist Government and we cooperate in every proper and feasible way with that Government in order to promote its security and stability. All of these military and related activities will be continued.

In addition, there was signed last December a mutual defense treaty between this Government and the Republic of China covering Formosa and the neighboring Pescadores. It is a treaty of purely defensive character. That treaty is now before the Senate of the United States.

Meanwhile Communist China has pursued a series of provocative political and military actions, establishing a pattern of aggressive purpose. That purpose, they proclaim, is the conquest of Formosa.

In September 1954 the Chinese Communists opened up heavy artillery fire upon Quemoy Island, one of the natural approaches to Formosa, which had for several years been under the uncontested control of the Republic of China. Then came air attacks of mounting intensity against other Free China islands, notably those in the vicinity of the Tachen group to the north of Formosa. One small island (Ichang) was seized last week by air and amphibious operations after a gallant few fought bravely for days against overwhelming odds. There have been recent heavy air attacks and artillery fire against the main Tachen Islands themselves.

The Chinese Communists themselves assert that these attacks are a prelude to the conquest of Formosa. For example, after the fall of Ichang, the Peiping radio said that it showed a "determined will to fight for the liberation of Taiwan [Formosa]. Our people will use all their strength to fulfill that task."

Clearly, this existing and developing situation poses a serious danger to the security of our country and of the entire Pacific area and, indeed, to the peace of the world. We believe that the situation is one for appropriate action of the United Nations under its charter, for the purpose of ending the present hostilities in that area. We would welcome assumption of such jurisdiction by that body.

Meanwhile, the situation has become sufficiently critical to impel me, without awaiting action by the United Nations, to ask the Congress to participate now, by specific resolution, in measures designed to improve the prospects for

peace. These measures would contemplate the use of the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary to assure the security of Formosa and the Pescadores.

The actions that the United States must be ready to undertake are of various kinds. For example, we must be ready to assist the Republic of China to redeploy and consolidate its forces if it should so desire. Some of these forces are scattered throughout the smaller offshore islands as a result of historical rather than military reasons directly related to defending Formosa. Because of the air situation in the area, withdrawals for the purpose of redeployment of Chinese Nationalist forces would be impractical without assistance of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Moreover, we must be alert to any concentration or employment of Chinese Communist forces obviously undertaken to facilitate attack upon Formosa, and be prepared to take appropriate military action.

I do not suggest that the United States enlarge its defensive obligations beyond Formosa and the Pescadores as provided by the treaty now awaiting ratification. But unhappily, the danger of armed attack directed against that area compels us to take into account closely related localities and actions which, under current conditions, might determine the failure or the success of such an attack. The authority that may be accorded by the Congress would be used only in situations which are recognizable as parts of, or definite preliminaries to, an attack against the main positions of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Authority for some of the actions which might be required would be inherent in the authority of the Commander in Chief. Until Congress can act I would not hesitate, so far as my constitutional powers extend, to take whatever emergency action might be forced upon us in order to protect the rights and security of the United States.

However, a suitable congressional resolution would clearly and publicly establish the authority of the President as Commander in Chief to employ the Armed Forces of this Nation promptly and effectively for the purposes indicated if in his judgment it became necessary. It would make clear the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress, and our people. Thus it will reduce the possibility that the Chinese Communists, misjudging our firm purpose and national unity, might be disposed to challenge the position of the United States, and precipitate a major crisis which even they would neither anticipate nor desire.

In the interest of peace, therefore, the United States must remove any doubt regarding our readiness to fight, if necessary, to preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa, and to engage in whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose.

To make this plain requires not only Presidential action but also congressional action. In a situation such as now confronts us, and under modern conditions of warfare, it would not be prudent to await the emergency before coming to the Congress. Then it might be too

late. Already the warning signals are flying.

I believe that the threatening aspects of the present situation, if resolutely faced, may be temporary in character. Consequently, I recommend that the resolution expire as soon as the President is able to report to the Congress that the peace and security of the area are reasonably assured by international conditions, resulting from United Nations action or otherwise.

Again I say that we would welcome action by the United Nations which might, in fact, bring an end to the active hostilities in the area. This critical situation has been created by the choice of the Chinese Communists, not by us. Their offensive military intent has been flaunted to the whole world by words and by deeds. Just as they created the situation, so they can end it if they so choose.

What we are now seeking is primarily to clarify present policy and to unite in its application. We are not establishing a new policy. Consequently, my recommendations do not call for an increase in the Armed Forces of the United States or any acceleration in military procurement or levels of defense production. If any unforeseen emergency arises requiring any change, I will communicate with the Congress. I hope, however, that the effect of an appropriate congressional resolution will be to calm the situation rather than to create further conflict.

One final point. The action I request is, of course, no substitute for the treaty with the Republic of China which we have signed and which I have transmitted to the Senate. Indeed, present circumstances make it more than ever important that this basic agreement should be promptly brought into force, as a solemn evidence of our determination to stand fast in the agreed treaty area and to thwart all attacks directed against it. If delay should make us appear indecisive in this basic report, the pressures and dangers would surely mount.

Our purpose is peace. That cause will be served if, with your help, we demonstrate our unity and our determination. In all that we do we shall remain faithful to our obligations as a member of the United Nations to be ready to settle our international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

For the reasons outlined in this message, I respectfully request that the Congress take appropriate action to carry out the recommendations contained herein.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, January 24, 1955.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2091. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the author-

ity granted him on Thursday, January 20, 1955, he did on January 21, 1955, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 2091. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES FOR NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: At 11 a. m. on Wednesday, January 26, ground-breaking ceremonies for the New Senate Office Building will be held at the site, First Street between B and C Streets NE. The Senate Office Building Commission extends to you and the membership and officials of the House of Representatives a cordial invitation to join with us and the membership of the United States Senate at this ceremony.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

W. A. PURTELL,
Chairman,
Senate Office Building Commission.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes tomorrow, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BURLESON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore granted.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the time granted me under a special order for today and that I may address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 37th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence, it is my privilege to bring to the minds of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and to the American people the struggle and the suffering of this brave group of people. For some years past

even to the present time, they have been captive souls of the totalitarian hordes of the Soviet Union, a fate not chosen but forced upon them by the brute will of the masters of the Kremlin.

The complete story of what the Ukrainians have been subjected to is not likely ever to be known. Purges, famines, and Siberian exile orders for the past 35 years have taken their toll. Yet, by the very fact that the Soviets have resorted to such measures, we are convinced that the love of freedom and of justice burns in the hearts of these people and sparks their actions and their attitudes. They are our allies, in spirit if not in fact, and we, who now hold high the torch of liberty, must stop at nothing in our efforts to see that the Ukraine regains its place among the free nations of the world.

To those who say that the Ukraine holds a seat in the United Nations and allies itself with the U. S. S. R. in every test of strength, it is necessary to point out that the Soviet Union pressured the United Nations into admitting the Ukraine as an independent state, although the bare facts of history blatantly show that the Ukraine has been a puppet state of the Soviet Union since 1920, and is one of the "republics" of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, all of which are directly under the thumb of Moscow. The Ukrainian representatives in the United Nations are lesser ambassadors of Malenkov and no more represent the people of the Ukraine than they do the people of the United States.

Our Ukrainian friends bitterly resent and have persistently fought the domination to which they have been subjected. Their valiant resistance to their oppressors is well known and serves as a symbol to us of the necessity for continuing our own resistance to the Communist menace and for furthering the cause of the liberation of all the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

UNITED STATES GOAL—LIBERATION OF ALL CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, peaceful co-existence with communism is impossible until Red imperialism purges itself of the aggressions it has committed against humanity and liberates all the enslaved nations within the Communist empire.

As the leader of the free world, and as the one last hope of oppressed peoples everywhere, the United States must reaffirm its stand on this anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day.

On January 22, 1918, in line with the principle of self-determination, the Ukrainian people proclaimed their independence.

In 1920, after fierce resistance, they were physically conquered by the Communist invaders.

The Ukrainians, who are not Russians, have never surrendered their legitimate claims for independence.

The very fact that the Moscow Communists demanded and secured membership in the United Nations for the sovereign Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, theoretically separate from Russia itself, was an implied admission of Ukraine's case for recognition, even though Moscow did not so intend it.

Recent moves on the world's diplomatic front have aroused concern that the United States is beginning to shift its position, and conceal its gradual abandonment of moral principle in favor of expediency, to hush-hush its original support of captive peoples, and slide over toward a so-called practical program of coexistence with communism.

Similar to the way in which it apparently wrote off 140,000 American casualties in Korea, and is apparently passing the buck on the fate of hundreds of Americans still held captive by Russian and Chinese Communists to a United Nations which seems only capable of making concessions in the name of an illusory peace.

Ukrainian Independence Day reminds Americans, if not some architects of their foreign policy, that the moral values of courage and honor are indispensable if we are to maintain faith in ourselves and in those who look to the United States for help in winning their independence.

LIBRARY SERVICES BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today 21 Members of the House, representing both sides of the aisle, are introducing identical bills to remedy the current serious deficiencies in public library service to our rural areas.

For my part, I am sponsoring this bill because I feel that it is essential to the educational program of the Nation. Public libraries have been long recognized as a necessary part of our educational facilities, but they have lagged far below their potentialities despite the efforts of States and local communities.

Education does not stop with formal schooling. It must meet the rapidly changing needs of the times, in business, in industry, and in cultural developments. The public library, an agency serving all ages, all classes, and all creeds, is particularly fitted to perform this function.

Unfortunately, according to an article by Benjamin Fine which appeared in the New York Times on June 18, 1953, and I quote:

The public libraries of the United States are in a deplorable condition. Most of the 7,500 separate library systems of the country are substandard with insufficient reading material and inadequate staff the general rule. More than 53 million people do not have easy access to books, while 24 million have no public library service of any kind.

The preceding figure is actually much larger because the New York Times study covered only 40 of the 48 States.

The legislation which is being proposed today will stimulate the States to take the steps necessary in attaining the goal of adequate public library services needed to insure that our Nation has the maximum number of educated citizens capable of making sound judgments and taking wise actions on the problems facing the United States and the world today.

The library services bill authorizes an appropriation of \$7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period on a matching basis. Each State would receive an original allotment of \$40,000, plus additional funds based on the ratio of its rural population to the total rural population of the United States. The State library agency has control over the formulation and operation of the plan under which these funds would be used. There are no Federal controls except the routine ones necessary for safeguarding Federal money.

Eighteen national organizations representing education, farm, labor, civic, and veteran groups are supporting this legislation. These organizations believe that library facilities aid people to do a better job, to learn new skills, and to understand current problems.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, how wise it is to come to the Congress, in accordance with the Constitution, for the support the President needs, to keep the peace.

How different from the action of the Truman administration which sent us to war first and told the Congress about it some hours later.

As President Eisenhower said:

It would not be prudent to await the emergency before coming to the Congress. Then it might be too late.

We have behind us the lesson of Truman-Acheson failure to face up to the threatening aspects of the North Korean-Chinese situation until arrogant invasion forced decision upon our temporizing leaders in the middle of the night.

When the startling news of our unexpected injection into the Korean war was gently broken to a nearly empty House Chamber—having been held until most Members were at lunch—I said to the Member who broke the sudden news: "I just hope you are not moving in with too little, too late." History shows we were utterly unprepared, that our initial entry with too little led to the tragic casualty lists which were the price of diplomatic misjudgment.

History will also record that we acted too late to prevent that war and with too little to end it during those early critical months when our commanders waited for the support and for the orders which never came.

Had the kind of warning to the Communists which Eisenhower issued been

given by Truman to the Communists in 1949 and 1950, we probably could have avoided the tragedy of the Korean war.

Today's message gives us a better chance to avoid war—and equally to avoid being caught unprepared—in the Asian area. Also, the best way to unite the American people in their own defense is to take them and their Congress into the administration's confidence—and not to spring things on them in the middle of the night.

PAYMENT OF TRAVELING COSTS TO VISIT PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to authorize payment of the travel costs incurred by relatives of the men who are prisoners of the Chinese Communists, if it really works out that the Communists are serious and that visits will be permitted. To my surprise, this proposal has been misunderstood and even the subject of some controversy. A brief clarifying statement seems to be in order.

In the first place, it would be entirely inappropriate for any of us here in Congress to urge these unfortunate men and women to decide one way or the other, whether they go or stay. That was not my intention.

In the second place, it would be highly inappropriate for us to interfere with whatever negotiations or policy determinations the executive branch may ultimately undertake. I had no thought of forcing the hand of the President or his advisers.

But, Mr. Speaker, this small matter of defraying the expense, if and when such travel is undertaken, does fall squarely within our province as the appropriating authority for our Government. I felt—and I still feel with all my heart—that we should hasten to remove any question of expense from the other and broader considerations that confront us.

One of these men, unjustly imprisoned in a hostile foreign land as a result of strategy and policy that he had no hand in formulating, would simply be unable to understand even a suggestion that his Government might deprive him of an opportunity—if it turns out to be that—to receive a visit from his family and loved ones. We must not forget we are dealing with individual human beings, loyal and devoted citizens whose service to our country has put them in a terrible position.

I cannot conceive of trifling with their feelings and the possibility, remote though it may be, of improving their situation before we win their ultimate release. That alone would be enough to merit swift action in their behalf.

But beyond there is something more important. This is an obvious propaganda device, cleverly pitched at us by Chou En Lai. The world is watching our reaction. And if the United States is to turn the offer down, let it be done in

the considered terms of great policy and not in any sense through niggling quibbles over details.

It is my hope that we will take this offer calmly in our stride, demonstrating that we are absolutely sure of ourselves and sure of our ground all the way through. If, as is conceivable, the Chinese Reds are really indulging a cruel and heartless bit of trickery at the expense of the feelings of these unfortunate people, let the consequences rest squarely on their heads—and not on ours because we held back in apprehension. Least of all, can we afford further talk, such as has been reported in the press, that the wives and mothers who are suddenly faced with this surprising suggestion must turn it aside because they have no funds to make the trip. What could be more damning and a more entirely wrong picture of our good, rich, and warmhearted Nation?

ATOMIC TESTS AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have today mailed to each Member of Congress a letter inviting them to attend the spring series of atomic tests to be conducted at the Nevada test site.

I sincerely hope that every Member who possibly can, will arrange to attend one of these test operations. Atomic weapons are the keystone of our defense against militant communism, and the better informed Members of Congress are, concerning this vital weapon, the better we all will be equipped to deal effectively with the problems of defense and foreign relations which now press so urgently upon us.

The trip will require approximately 5 days. This may seem like a rather long period to be absent from Washington. However, the requirements of public safety, which are a paramount concern of the Atomic Energy Commission, require that weather conditions be ideal for a test before a shot can be fired. I am sure that every Member of Congress will wholeheartedly support this prudent approach on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission. Since one cannot predict ahead of time the precise day on which a test can be fired the Commission has suggested that the Members plan a 5-day visit. I can assure you that the 5 days will not be wasted. In addition to observing a test shot the Members will be given a nontechnical briefing concerning the test program and the method of conducting tests, and will be given an opportunity to observe the results of previous tests. If conditions permit, the Members will also have an opportunity to see firsthand the results of the test which they observe.

The Members will be transported to and from the test site in pressurized-

cabin aircraft of the Military Air Transport Command, a service whose record for safe and comfortable flying is second to none in the world. Adequate facilities will be provided for any ladies in the House who would like to go. Several Congresswomen attended the tests in 1953 and they have all reported to me that they found the trip to be tremendously worthwhile in carrying out their official responsibilities as Members of Congress, and that, in addition, the trip was a most pleasant and enjoyable one.

In closing I should like to recall the old Chinese proverb, "One look is worth a thousand words." This proverb is particularly apt as regards atomic weapons for atomic weapons are a force that is so new and so different that they must be seen to be fully comprehended. I, therefore, again urge every Member of Congress who can possibly do so to take this opportunity to personally observe an atomic test.

MRS. HARRIET McCARRAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a letter received from Mrs. Harriet McCarran, widow of the late Senator Pat McCarran, expressing the thanks of herself and family for recent action taken by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 22, 1955.
Mr. RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. ROBERTS: The family of the late Honorable Pat McCarran deeply appreciate the respect shown to his memory on the part of the Members of the House of Representatives. We, the family, will cherish the resolution which the Members of this august body offered in his memory. To each and every person in the House of Representatives we send our sincere thanks and deep appreciation. The resolution will be framed and placed with the many historical documents in the Nevada State Museum, where the other testimonial letters to our beloved husband and father will be preserved.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. HARRIET McCARRAN AND FAMILY.

TELEVISION AND BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. MEADER. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. With the 84th Congress now organizing its committees, it seems to me important to have a clear ruling on the authority of committees to disseminate or permit the dissemination of news of their hearings and proceedings.

By way of background, I might say that this question was raised by the present minority leader in the 82d Congress on the 25th of February 1952. At that time the Speaker expressed the opinion that the rules of the House did not now

authorize committees to permit radio and television coverage of their public hearings. I should like to propound that same inquiry but ask for a little greater clarification as to just what news coverage is permissible under the rules of the House of committee public hearings; whether news reporters are permitted to be present; whether photographers taking still pictures are permitted to be present; whether motion picture cameras for newsreel purposes with sound are permitted to be present; whether live radio broadcasting or telecasting or recorded radio broadcasting are permissible.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule and also make a statement. Something along the same line was propounded to the present occupant of the chair by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] February 25, 1952.

Rule XI of the House provides that the rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the committees of the House of Representatives so far as applicable. The Chair does not think anyone would contend that the House of Representatives is authorized to televise its proceedings or put them on the radio. The Chair held at that time that this was outside of the rules and also held in response to another inquiry that a committee sitting outside of Washington was under the same rules as a committee inside of Washington, and the Chair held that it was controlled by the same rules.

There is nothing new with reference to this, because the same rules are in effect now in the House of Representatives as they were on February 25, 1952, and until the rules are changed, which would have to come from a resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted by the House changing the rules of the House, the Chair still thinks that it is not in accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives or its committees to televise or broadcast hearings or actions before any committee of the House, and so holds and will hold unless and until the rules of the House are amended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps due to my lack of understanding, does the Chair then hold that a regular standing committee of the House cannot authorize broadcasting either by radio or television of its hearings?

The SPEAKER. That is what the Chair held in 1952 and that is what the Chair holds in 1955.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Will newsreel cameras be permitted to be present in the committee room during public hearings?

The SPEAKER. The reply is the same. It is the same as television.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the Speaker also hold that in the absence of any rule of

the House on this subject committees should be required to prohibit the taking of photographs before, during, or after any committee hearing if the Speaker so directed?

The SPEAKER. That is a question to be decided by the committee. The present occupant of the chair was chairman of a committee at one time. When the photographers came in, the Chair always told them they could take pictures of the committee or anyone in the room they wanted to until the proceedings of the committee began. Then they were asked to retire, and they always did retire.

Mr. SCOTT. Is it a correct statement, then, that the matter of photographs before, during, or after committee hearings is in the discretion of the committee chairman or the duly designated presiding officer?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hold the photographs could be taken before and after the proceedings, but not during them.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair.

"ORDER IS HEAVEN'S FIRST LAW"

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

May the Chair say that the gentleman from Michigan has upon occasion made reference to the rules of the House and their application and the Chair thinks he intends to do that again now. The Chair thinks his statement will be interesting and very helpful to the Members if they will heed it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Michigan has in times past called the attention of the Members of the House to the decorum and the comity that should exist between the Members of this House when on the floor and he has done it in a very effective and delightful way. I do feel that perhaps the Members present would like to listen to what the gentleman from Michigan says. Because of that I ask that particular attention be given to the gentleman from Michigan at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, nearly two centuries ago a noted author declared that order is heaven's first law. The truth of that statement applies to our own day and generation with ever-increasing force and validity.

When your constituents and mine come to Washington, it is almost certain that they will visit this Capitol Building. Their presence may be observed daily when they occupy the galleries of the House and especially when Congress is in session.

Members who have served here any length of time have heard with chagrin and embarrassment the harsh criticism from the visitors directed at, what appears to them, a lack of reverence, dignity, and respect for this historic Chamber.

Information from officials of the House indicates that hardly a week passes without complaints regarding our habits and our conduct on the floor.

Here in the House of Representatives the people speak and here their voice is heard. This is their forum, established by our forefathers. From them come the noble and distinct character of American institutions.

The very walls of this Chamber echo with the voices of our great and our past. It is rich in the traditions of our Nation. Many whose names adorn the pages of history labored in this room to serve the cause of freedom and self-government. They were the torchbearers of humanity's forward march.

May God help us to preserve their influence and labors by reverence for this notable place and forbid that we should ever be irreverent toward it and the memory of those who made our day possible.

Our position as Members of Congress is one of great responsibility. If a proper attitude and proper conduct toward the position to which we have been elevated is wanting, we deface and impoverish our position in the eyes of those who pass this way.

Infraction of the rules in the game of life brings punishment and penalty. The penalty we pay individually and collectively is the loss of respect, the loss of prestige, the loss of faith and confidence, and a gradual breaking down of self-government by a free people.

This House of Representatives is governed by rules, some as old as the Government itself. They were designed to govern the conduct of Members on this floor and the orderly procedure of our legislative work.

Not one of us here is entirely blameless for breaking the rules of the House. In a thoughtless moment, and unconsciously, many of us have broken the written and long-established code of conduct for this floor. Many of the older Members, knowingly, and many of the newer Members, unknowingly, because of unfamiliarity with the rules, have allowed certain habits to violate the proprieties of this body.

For the benefit of new Members and to remind many of the older Members, including myself, the observations I am about to make are confined solely to the rules governing our conduct on this floor. My remarks are not intended as a scolding of any Member individually or of the House collectively.

I now come to the rules violated daily in this forum. How should a Member address our Presiding Officer? At public gatherings throughout the country it is customary and in good taste to say, "Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen," and so forth. In this Hall such a salutation is improper and a distinct breach of the rule.

In recent years, almost daily, Members, both old and new, have taken their place here in the well of the House and commenced their remarks with "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen." The rule requires a Member to address himself to "Mr. Speaker" or, if the House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to "Mr. Chair-

man." To add more is a slight upon the Speaker, who represents the House in its organization. When we address the Chair, we address the entire membership of the House.

It is a violation of precedent, and bad form, to conclude an address by adding the words, "I thank you." There is no necessity for any Member to thank anyone. We speak as a matter of right.

Express provision is made for the manner in which a Member may address the House. Rule XIV, clause 1, reads:

When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor, or from the Clerk's desk.

Committees of the House should not be designated as "The Rules Committee," "the Appropriations Committee," and so forth. The proper way to designate any committee of the House is to say, "The Committee on Rules," "the Committee on Appropriations," "the Committee on Un-American Activities," and so forth.

Another rule violated daily is rule XIV, clause 7, which provides:

While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair.

It has become a custom for Members to walk in front of a Member while he is addressing the House from the lecterns here in the well of the House. Such practices are a violation of a long-established rule of this body and are a contributing cause to the confusion and distraction evidenced on this floor from day to day. To walk in front of a Member who is speaking is objectionable and discourteous.

Another part of clause 7, rule XIV, grossly violated by many Members, reads as follows:

During the session of the House no Member * * * shall smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

What constitutes the floor of the House? The space behind the rail is the floor of the House as much as the space in front of the Speaker's rostrum. Smoking behind the rail is smoking on the floor of the House and equally an infraction of the rule; it is most obnoxious to our visitors in the galleries. Walking into the Chamber with a cigar or pipe held in the mouth, whether lighted or not, is an invitation for caustic criticism and disparaging remarks on the part of the public who come to visit our sessions.

A practice as defenseless as it is objectionable is the habit of placing one's feet against or on top of the seat in front of one. This habit, a clear and distinct breach of the rules of decorum of this House, is most noticeable from the galleries and draws the sharpest criticism and adverse comment from those who come to visit this legislative body in action.

Reading newspapers on this floor when the House is in session may not fall within the text of any definite rule, but such a habit conveys to the public, and to the Members of the House, an impression of the want of interest, indifference to legislative duty, and failure of attention to the matter under discussion on the floor.

A practice that has grown to be a habit is that of referring to a Member in the second person as "you" or "your." Some distinguished Members, with long service here, have designated their colleagues by their given names, such as "John" and "Jim." We all know better. These are plain violations of ordinary parliamentary procedure. Each of us can make his contribution in preserving dignity and orderly conduct during our sessions by observing and obeying the rules of the House. The proper way to address a colleague is "the gentleman or gentlewoman from Maine," or which-ever State the Member represents.

Dignity and decorum commensurate with the greatness of this body, and the power we possess, should prevail at all times in the discharge of our duty to the Nation. These matters may seem small, unimportant, and of no serious consequence in themselves, but upon the whole they are destructive of the respect and confidence of the people.

The rules of the House provide that the Speaker "shall preserve order and decorum"—rule I, clause 2. Let every Member constitute himself a committee of one to assist the Speaker in the discharge of his duty by seeing to it that the rules are respected and obeyed.

By reason of our membership here, each Member is clothed with tremendous power over the lives and destiny of a mighty people. With that power goes a corresponding responsibility to discharge the trust reposed in us by the people. Every word we speak, every decision we render, is weighted with the position we hold. The confidence and faith of the people in the legislative branch of their Government must be preserved if the Republic of the United States is to survive.

The lamps of freedom have been going out all over this world. Representative government has been and is under attack by a totalitarian philosophy of government. May we be worthy of the high honor conferred upon us as Members of Congress by discharging our responsibility to the Nation with that dignity and decorum which the people have a right to expect from us.

May the visitor to these galleries observe in us a genuine respect for this House of Representatives of the American people, and leave with greater love for our Republic and greater pride in American citizenship.

Let us all remember that "Order is heaven's first law."

THE LATE HONORABLE ERLAND H. HEDRICK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad responsibility to inform the House of the passing of a distinguished

former Member from the Sixth District of West Virginia, Erland Harold Hedrick. Dr. Hedrick, as he was affectionately called by his many friends, died on September 20, 1954, shortly after the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

Erland Harold Hedrick was born in Mercer County, W. Va., on August 9, 1894. He attended the grammar schools of Beckley where his parents moved when he was about 10 years of age. After attending Beckley Institute, he was graduated from the University of Maryland with an M. D. degree in June of 1917. Following his graduation, he served in the United States Army Medical Corps as a first lieutenant for 18 months. Upon his discharge from the service after the close of World War I, he returned to Beckley and began a very successful medical practice. He had served as examiner for the Veterans' Administration since 1919, and he served as city health officer and county health officer at various times. He was interested in the banking business for many years, and he became vice president and director of the Raleigh County Bank in Beckley. He was coowner of an ice-cream business, a theater business, and a coal company. Dr. Hedrick served as president of the Raleigh County Medical Society in 1932, and he was a member of the West Virginia State Medical Association and the American Medical Association, being made a life member in all three in 1954, after a membership of more than 34 years. He was a member of the American Legion, the Loyal Order of Moose, and a charter member of the Beckley Kiwanis Club. Dr. Hedrick was general superintendent of Pinecrest Tuberculosis Sanitarium in 1933 and 1934, a position which he held in conjunction with his private medical practice. He resigned as general superintendent to run for the House of Representatives from West Virginia's sixth district. He was elected in 1944 to the 79th Congress of the United States. His majority was approximately 24,000, and he served in the succeeding 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses, in each instance being reelected by a large majority. He was a member of the Public Lands Committee and the House Appropriations Committee. In 1952 he ran for Governor of West Virginia and received a tremendous vote.

Dr. Hedrick married Miss Myrtle Adelle Wade of Nashville, Tenn., on June 23, 1943, and they made their home at 713 Woodlawn Avenue in Beckley. In February of last year, he became ill with virus pneumonia and was found to be suffering with a heart condition. Retiring from his office on that date, he continued ill until his death in September. He was buried in Sunset Memorial Park in Beckley. Only his widow and companion survives, a companion who helped him fight his political battles and who was active in the Congressional Woman's Democrat Club, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that "a man that hath friends must show himself friendly." Dr. Hedrick showed himself friendly, and he left behind a host of friends. He was gentle in his disposition, charm-

ing in his personality, captivating and ingratiating in his manner. He was a faithful servant, a good citizen, and a fine American. His county, his State, and his people have suffered from his loss.

Mr. Speaker, since the voice of Abel cried unto its Creator from the ground, death has been in the world; and the spoiler, among the works of the Almighty. Someone has spoken of death as a pleasant journey; another has said it is a state of rest; another, that it is a mystery; and still another, that it is a beautiful adventure. But it never fails to leave behind it a trail of sorrow and of tears. The piercing cry of King David at the loss of Absalom, and the soft weeping of Jesus at the tomb of Lazarus have echoed and reechoed a thousand billion times in the hearts of men throughout the centuries. All that are born must die. We know not where or how the silent messenger will bid us come.

We know when moons shall wane,
And summer birds from far shall cross the sea;
When autumn hues shall tinge the golden grain,
But, death, oh who shall tell us when to look for thee?
Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,
And stars to set—but all
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, oh death.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hedrick has gone on into the valley of the shadows. His voice and pleasant smile will be heard and seen no more in these chambers. Yet, in the night of death, hope sees a star. Joyous is the belief that we can be rejoined in a greater forum and in a lovelier world, in a city "that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God."

To his widow, his relatives, and his friends I extend my heartfelt sympathy. May they find comfort in the words of One who, 15 centuries after Job, came saying:

Be thou faithful until death, and I shall give thee a crown of life.
Let Fate do her worst, there are relics of joy,
Bright dreams of the past that she cannot destroy;
Which come in the nighttime of sorrow and care,
And bring back the features that joy used to wear.
Long, long be my heart with such memories filled!
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled—
You may break, you may shatter the vase, if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang 'round it still.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to this beautiful and deserved tribute to our former colleague. It was my privilege to be closely associated with Dr. Hedrick here in the Congress. We served on the Appropriations Committee together.

I know Dr. Hedrick intimately and knew of his work in the Congress. He

was a hard worker and a very able and conscientious Member of this body. He served his district, his State, and the Nation well.

Dr. Hedrick was also a frequent visitor to my district. His brother resides in Henrico County, Va., which is in my district. The family is outstanding in the community. They have served the county and my district as Dr. Hedrick served in West Virginia.

His nephew is chief of police of the county. He has made an excellent record as the chief law-enforcement officer and enjoys the confidence and respect of the people.

It is a great privilege to me to join in this tribute to one of our colleagues for whom I had great love and affection.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hedrick and I came to the 79th Congress together. We served on the old Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. We were thrown together as freshman Congressmen, and I came to know and admire him and I came to know and admire his very charming wife. I was shocked when I heard of his death, and I want to join in paying a well-earned tribute to a man who has fulfilled his obligations to his State, to his Nation, and to his God.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the glowing and well-deserved tribute that my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has paid to the late Dr. Hedrick, his predecessor in the House from the Sixth West Virginia District. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that Dr. Hedrick had the facility and took advantage of his opportunity to become acquainted with a greater number of Members of this House than probably any other Member serving in the sessions of the Congress in which he honored the Sixth District of West Virginia. We will all miss Dr. Hedrick, not only the West Virginia delegation but his many intimate friends that he acquired over the years that he served with outstanding ability in the Congress of the United States. I want to join the gentleman in expressing my deepest feelings of condolence to the widow of the late Dr. Hedrick. I am sure that the doctor will live long in the memories of the Members of the House in which he became so well acquainted for his friendly and kindly attitude to everyone with whom he came in contact.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to those rendering eulogies to Dr. Hedrick. I served with him in the House for 8 years. During that time we had many intimate and close conversations. Partly because both he and I were physicians, we had an opportunity to exchange ideas. During the 8 years Dr. Hedrick and I served together as members of the Committee on Public Lands, we took a trip

out through the great Northwest, traveling a great deal of the way by automobile. When you travel with a man, you learn something about him. For 2 years we served together on a special committee investigating chemicals in foods and cosmetics. During my association with Dr. Hedrick, I learned to know him as a man of integrity, of honesty, a man of great patriotism, truly a fine man, and it was with regret that I learned of his passing. Dr. Hedrick was, after all, a man that should be in the prime of life. He did a good job here in the Congress of the United States. I knew that he was a good physician and well respected and loved by those at home. I will miss Dr. Hedrick because of the numerous times that we sat down together and talked about the little and the big things of life. I join with the gentleman and the others in extending sympathies to his wife and to his friends.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in expressing my appreciation of Dr. Hedrick. I also served on a special committee with him. I enjoyed his association, and I am sure that those of us who served with him will miss him because of his alert understanding of all legislation that was under consideration by the House. I became intimately acquainted with both him and his wife, and I want to express my sincere sympathies and condolences to Mrs. Hedrick and the people of the district and to the State of West Virginia who have lost a patriotic and a devoted public servant in the passing of Dr. Hedrick.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for bringing to the attention of the Congress the sad tidings of the recent death of Dr. Erland H. Hedrick, who ably represented the 6th District of West Virginia in the House in the 79th, 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses before voluntarily withdrawing. I want to associate myself with the excellent statement which the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has made about his predecessor.

The Sixth District adjoins the district which I have the honor to represent. Our districts have many problems in common. During Dr. Hedrick's term of office here, he always worked closely with my late husband, John Kee, and later with me on those issues of mutual concern to our congressional districts and our State. Consequently, we came to know him well as colleague as well as friend, and to admire the hard work and effective effort which he put into the work of representing his district.

A man of many talents and of a really remarkable range of interests, Dr. Hedrick was a physician, banker, political

leader, and businessman. As a businessman he was interested in and active in a variety of enterprises, including coal, ice cream, real estate, and theaters. Thus, he was, indeed, familiar with the issues and the problems and the technical details of legislation involving the business community as well as other aspects of our society.

Those of us who served with him, Mr. Speaker, were always uplifted by his pleasant manner, his vast knowledge, and his friendliness. In company with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] I want to extend my sympathy to Dr. Hedrick's widow, other members of his family, and to his many friends.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that this solemn and dignified ceremony take place in this great forum of democracy as a tribute from this body to the life and memory of one of West Virginia's most distinguished sons.

Not only do I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the people of the congressional district represented for so many years, and so ably, by Dr. Hedrick, but I extend that expression of sympathy to the entire Nation. For while it is true, his home town, his constituency and his State lost a good neighbor, a firm friend, and outstanding public servant, the United States lost a great American.

As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, in this distinguished body some Members become more close friends than others. I shall always be proud to declare that Dr. Hedrick was one of my close and personal friends. I often wondered why Congressman Hedrick, a learned practitioner of the ancient and noble calling of medicine, entered the rough and tumble arena of politics. By knowing the good doctor as I did, and as long and as well as I did, I know from his great heart and from his practice of medicine and from his knowledge and love of his fellow men, there sprang this desire to bring his understanding and feelings to public service.

In performance of our duties in our great Committee on Appropriations of the House, year after year, in moments of great stress of soul searching in matters dealing with the lives and fortunes of America, and therefore, the world, I saw Dr. Hedrick stand firm in his belief in his God and country to always do the right thing.

I have had occasion, in the performance of our official duties, to visit various countries of Western Europe in company with the distinguished Dr. Hedrick. His charm and great sense of humor and deep appreciation of other people and other problems, gave us an ambassador of good will to these other people at a time that they and we needed understanding more than any other thing.

I enjoyed the visits made by me to the home of the good doctor and his gracious wife. Accompanied by my wife, who I am pleased to say is a dear and close friend of Mrs. Hedrick, both in Washington during our years there and since,

the warmth and pleasantness of hospitality for which West Virginia is famous, was another cause for increasing endearment of our friendship.

And so today, with this solemnity in the fullness of my heart, Mr. Speaker, I can look toward the heaven and say to my good friend Congressman Hedrick in the words of the poet, which so well typifies your service to the people and your country:

So live, that when thy summons comes to leave that shore, which never yet has seen the image of a homeward sail, may perfect peace be yours, and where you lie dreaming know that you have not lived and have not died in vain.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, just as the hearts of many are filled with sadness today, so is mine. In the passing of Erland Harold Hedrick, I lost a personal friend, the State of West Virginia lost a great son, and the Nation lost one of its most distinguished citizens.

Dr. Hedrick was a man who had many friends, irrespective of political party, and irrespective of station in life. No words but kind words were ever spoken by him or of him. He was a fine public servant devoted to the interests of his people. We will all miss him, but the memory of him will live unblemished, untarnished, and unstained.

Mrs. McCormack and I wish to join with the gentleman from West Virginia who has so eloquently spoken in extending regrets to Mrs. Hedrick and the family.

THE ROSE STILL GROWS BEYOND THE WALL
Near a shady wall a rose once grew,

Budded and blossomed in God's free light,
Watered and fed by morning dew,
Shedding its sweetness day and night.

As it grew and blossomed fair and tall,
Slowly rising to loftier height,
It came to a crevice in the wall,
Through which there shone a beam of light.

Onward it crept with added strength,
With never a thought of fear or pride,
It followed the light through the crevice's length

And unfolded itself on the other side.
The light, the dew, the broadening view
Were found the same as they were before;
And it lost itself in beauties new,
Breathing its fragrance more and more.

Shall claim of death cause us to grieve,
And make our courage faint or fall?
Nay! Let us faith and hope receive:
The rose still grows beyond the wall.

Scattering fragrance far and wide,
Just as it did in the days of yore,
Just as it did on the other side,
Just as it will for evermore.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, may I add my voice to my colleagues who have preceded me in praise of the late Dr. Erland Harold Hedrick. My experience with Dr. Hedrick in the 81st and 82d Congresses has always been a source of pleasure. I had known Dr. Hedrick for a great many years and had always admired him. When I came here as a freshman in 1948, his advice and counsel were invaluable to me. He was

an excellent politician, a skillful legislator, and a sincere, kind man. He knew how to take first things first, but always seemed to have time for those things which seemed unimportant except to the individual who asked help.

Dr. Hedrick's experiences were varied. He was a physician, a soldier, a city and county executive, a banker, and a businessman. To this vast amount of experience he coupled a deep devotion to the people of his State and a sound philosophy of life to produce that which we all strive to be, a good representative. He represented excellently a district of greatly diversified interests with skill and devotion. His methods were always straightforward and his motives always honorable.

The men assembled here in this Chamber who knew him have lost a friend. The men here who were not fortunate enough to know the man will never realize their loss.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once again I find it necessary to alert my colleagues of the House to the dangers and the pitfalls contained in the proposal found in H. R. 1, to liberalize and to extend for a 3-year period our present Trade Agreements Act.

May I remind my colleagues of the House that the basic tariff law of the Nation is known as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, passed in 1930. I should like to explain particularly to the new Members of Congress who happen to be present on the floor today that our so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act is superimposed upon section 350 of the basic tariff law. This new act, which was largely the idea of Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, who was at that time Secretary of State, was conceived in the light of the situation that existed throughout the free world in those days. That, if you will remember, was the beginning of our depression period, and it was a depression period throughout the rest of the world. He conceived the idea that we should enlarge trade activities. He talked about American sailing vessels sailing on all of the seven seas.

The idea was fine at that time, I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Congress in writing its policy statement on the new idea of trade relations stated that it was for the purpose of enlarging trade and reducing unemployment. If you will recall back in 1933 and in 1934 when the Congress took action on this trade treaty we were still in the midst of our so-called great depression. The object of the Congress was to increase employment.

I submit to you that it has worked in the directly opposite manner. I challenge any Member of this House who happens to be a proponent of this legislation to show and to prove to this House that our trade policies have increased jobs for the American people more than

they have lost jobs for the American people.

Let us keep in mind what the word "reciprocity" means. It means that the United States agrees to lower our import duties on foreign-made goods in return for other nations' lowering their import duties on American goods that we wish to send into such countries. That is the idea of reciprocity.

May I say to my colleagues of the House that out of 22 articles made in my State of West Virginia on which concessions are made, so far as I have been able to find out at the present time only one single article receives concessions on that side of the reciprocal trade agreement, and I refer to West Virginia apples.

This agreement is no longer entitled to be called a reciprocal trade agreement. Reciprocity has disappeared. We, the American people, have been giving away further reductions in our import duties and our tariff rates until today the American tariff rates are among the lowest of all the 34 nations which are signatory members of the Geneva agreement on trade and treaties. Yet, we are being asked in House Resolution 1, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, that we further reduce our tariffs a total of 15 percent in the next 3 years, and that we enlarge the authority given the President to deal with trade matters, which is solely the business of the Congress. In that I see trouble ahead. Some of the suggestions are dangerous. For instance, the resolution goes so far as to attempt to write a blanket of legality over what has been taking place at Geneva since 1945, and I am speaking now of the present outlaw organization known as our Treaty on Trades and Tariffs, which is functioning as an international agreement without the consent of the American Congress. The proposals and the practices advocated by the Geneva Convention have never been submitted to the Congress of the United States or particularly to the other body for approval.

There are two divergent views on what the President is asking for in this 3-year extension of our trade policies with added authority. One of those viewpoints, that comes from the proponents of the legislation, is to the effect that since we intend to give away some of our wealth anyway to foreign nations, we had better do it on an economic basis rather than on an eleemosynary basis of just giving it away outright. That is the argument of the proponents of this legislation who are talking about more trade and less aid.

The other viewpoint, and that is the viewpoint held by the opponents of the renewal and extension of our trade policies, is that if you give the President what he is asking for in this legislation, you are sure to drive out of business completely more than 100 of our basic, small American producers who cannot possibly meet the competition they are being asked to meet from Europe and Japan on imports. Now, why can they not meet that competition? Congress is partly to blame for this situation. Only in the last session of the 83d Congress, we approved a tax bill which reduced the income tax on dividends coming

from foreign investments. By that act alone, you set up a 14 percentage point advantage for American capital to go abroad and establish factories to exploit cheap labor abroad in order to make these products to be brought to America under our trade treaty to take the jobs away from your American workmen. So I say to you, the Congress itself sometimes does strange things, and I submit to you that this is one of the strangest. Why we would today, after the last session of the Congress, oppose a tax bill as many on my side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the House, did, which contains a provision of that kind and now come along and swallow the same kind of proposition in the proposed broadening of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, is beyond me.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I call the attention of the House to the fact that Secretary of State Dulles on Monday, a week ago, testified that there were \$14 billion of reserves in Europe today, the highest dollar reserve in the entire history of the world, and yet we hear so much about this dollar scarcity to buy American goods.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I would like to call attention to the fact that the history of the tariff in the United States in the past has principally been a story of conflict between manufactured goods and farm products, and the industrial East and North and the agricultural South and West. Today, in 1955, the situation is changed. That is not the conflict today. The difference today is in the view between great units of mass production; big business, if you please; and the so-called small-business man, small manufacturer.

Big business is world conscious. It not only hopes to sell universally but it manufactures universally by establishing plants in many other countries. Its capital is not only locally invested, but it is invested in foreign countries where it is manufacturing products. This is not true of the small manufacturer. He makes goods for the local market, whether that market is in the United States or any particular section of the United States. He may not produce a superior product to one made elsewhere, but let me remind you that he employs American labor. He pays taxes to the Federal Government as well as to the local government, and his price is geared to the American standard of living.

If our small manufacturers are driven out of business, as you propose to do by this legislation, by a faulty economic policy, the social damage will be enormous.

Those who talk about a free market do make the point that the American manufacturer who cannot compete ought to go out of business, as an admission of his inefficiency. This position would have some virtue if he were permitted to compete on a basis of equality. There is where the actions of the Congress come in, in giving advantages, from the standpoint of Federal income taxes, by

saying to him that if his investment was abroad he could have better treatment as a taxpayer. What you are doing is making it more profitable and more enticing for American capital to be invested abroad than to be invested in the development of the resources of your own country. A free market is only possible if there are no subsidies, no rebates, and no economic tricks.

What are some of the economic tricks?

Let us go back just briefly to this question of reciprocity. I said to you that it was no longer a trade compact involving reciprocity. The American people have set up only 2 or 3 restrictions that I can recall at this time. One of those restrictions you will find in the general Agricultural Adjustment Act, which limits the import of cotton to this country. Another might be a similar provision that limits the amount of Canadian wheat that may be imported. I can remember another restriction when the trade treaty was written, in order to protect the infant sugarcane and beet-sugar industries in this country. There was a provision written in the Sugar Act that set up a 25-percent import quota on shipments of Cuban and Puerto Rican sugar to the United States. This may be considered restrictive. The only overall restriction that I can recall now was the peril point which was adopted by the 80th Congress and killed by the 81st Congress; and, a little later on, a proposal of my own, called the escape clause.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is also a safety valve on agricultural products.

We now have in the case of the six basic commodities restrictions on production on the part of our own farmers; in other words, if a person farms peanuts, tobacco, or cotton he cannot grow any more than his allotted acreage. This is done to keep the price up. Is there any danger of weakening that structure? Because if we bring in unrestricted production from abroad while our own farmers are being restricted we are going to create some sort of condition that is going to destroy the farm program. I would like to know what would be the effect of the new bill on the escape clause and on section 22.

Mr. BAILEY. I am pleased that the gentleman from Oklahoma has raised this question. If you will look at subsections (a) and (b) of section A of the pending legislation, that is the Cooper bill, that is something altogether new from what has already been done in reciprocal trade treaty legislation in the past. We give the President added power to reduce rates 15 percent over the next 3 years. We are allowing him to take a product that is on the trade list on which the ad valorem duty is above 50 percent and not only reduce that down to 50 percent of the basic rate set by the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1920, but we are going further and give him authority to cut it down further. We give added authority over the favored-nations clause, that is, the policy that those nations

which are signatories along with the United States in our trade agreements, are all treated alike; in other words, if you make a concession to one you have to make it to all. Now we go ahead and say that we are giving him authority over the control of quantitative restrictions. That is exactly what the gentleman from Oklahoma is talking about now. In the general agricultural act under that quantitative restriction provision the Congress wrote in an alternative. In the matter of cotton it specified that only 35,000 bales of foreign cotton could be shipped into this country with the exception of special types of cotton that we do not grow in this country.

Another restriction that the gentleman from Oklahoma had in mind was the restriction written on the importation of wheat. Wheat from Canada is now held to 800,000 bushels a year. Now we are going to give the President authority—and that authority will be delegated to the State Department, to people who sit around a table over in Geneva and bargain for new agreements when the Canadian people come along with the proposition that they have some things they would like to buy from United States they add to it the condition: "We want to know if you are going to be a little more liberal in your policy of imports on Canadian wheat." They could make that 80 million bushels instead of 800,000 bushels of Canadian wheat. We are just opening up an opportunity for that tribunal over at Geneva to bargain and to barter with the other countries on these reciprocal-trade agreements, to throw down the restrictions that are set up, the quantitative restrictions that are set up on wheat, cotton, peanuts, and on sugar, because it will affect all of those. Congress has set a precedent there, and I question the advisability of our changing it. There is exactly what I meant when I said it had dangerous provisions in it; I had reference to the new language contained in the proposal introduced by the gentleman which is the Randall Commission's report and the State Department's idea.

I believe Mr. Dulles acknowledged on cross-examination when he was a witness before the Ways and Means Committee that it was written by the State Department and the experts of the Randall Commission.

I question the wisdom of it. I am afraid that it is going to vest in some tribunal out from under the control of this Congress power to thwart the will of Congress.

In the speech I made on Monday last I asked: "How would you like to have your producers required to go to Geneva for redress of their grievances instead of coming to the Congress in Washington or to the Tariff Commission?" That is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The entire reciprocal trade-agreements program must be approached not in an across-the-board fashion but item by item. On the Pacific coast we have a

salmon-fishing industry that does a business in excess of \$100 million a year and employs more than 60,000 people. The Japanese just announced through their Ministry on Fisheries that they are expanding their fisheries operation from 7 cannery ships to 11 cannery ships, an increase of more than 50 percent. They are putting out to sea in the North Pacific and in the Atlantic a total of 284 fishing ships as compared with 160 fishing ships last year, an increase of 75 percent. The Japanese wage rate in the fishing industry is 19 cents an hour for men and 8 cents an hour for women. American workers simply cannot compete with those low wages. Unless the American fishing industry, which depends mostly on hand labor, is given as much or more protection than it has now, it is going to be destroyed by this increase in Japanese imports.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman for his observation and may I ask if he has the American wage rate that is being paid in the American fishing industry? How many American ships have been put out of the fishing business? Just what is the situation in the California fisheries?

OUR FISHING INDUSTRY NEEDS PROTECTION

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the American crab- and salmon-fishing industries will be confronted in 1955 with stiffer competition from the Japanese fishing industry than American fishermen and cannery workers ever have experienced heretofore.

I say this because the chief of the Japanese Government fishing agency recently announced that Japan is increasing her fishery activities in the North Pacific and Arctic Oceans by more than 50 percent and expects in 1955 to double her 1954 fish take from these waters.

A recent dispatch from Japan quotes the chief of the Government fishing agency as saying that Japan which in 1954 had 7 floating canneries operating in Pacific and Arctic waters will have 11 of these ships in 1955. The same dispatch says that instead of the 160 fishing boats operating from these mother canneries the Japanese in 1955 will have 284 of these boats, an increase of more than 75 percent.

The chief of the Japanese Government fishing agency predicted in that dispatch that Japanese fishermen will catch 40 million fish in 1955 or just about double her 1954 take.

The announcement of plans of the Japanese to expand her fishery activities makes it imperative that our State Department refrain from reducing tariffs on fishery products during the International Trade Conference which opens in Geneva in February. Workers in the fisheries of Japan receive wages of 8 cents an hour for women and less than 20 cents an hour for men. American fishermen and cannery workers cannot and should not be expected to compete with such low wage rates.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 1, following the legisla-

tive program in order for that day and any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour. I make this request, Mr. Speaker, at the suggestion of the majority leader, recalling that January 30 is the birthday of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, but that there will be exercises on Monday in memory of our martyred President, William McKinley, and that, therefore, Tuesday be set aside to observe the birthday of that great American, that immortal, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM OF FEDERAL LOANS TO ASSIST STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES IN BUILDING SCHOOLS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I submit for your attention a bill that I have just introduced. The purpose of this bill is to provide a program of Federal loans to assist States and local communities in building schools.

At the outset I wish to emphasize that partisanship has no place in our approach to the serious classroom shortage prevalent today in our elementary and secondary public schools. Many of the Members of Congress have introduced bills that would, if enacted, provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to our States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities. Everyone appears to be in agreement that this problem is urgent, that we can no longer delay in taking some form of action, and that there should be full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school-construction requirements.

The vigorous and sustained efforts of the States and local communities to provide classrooms needed for free public education has not been sufficient to meet the number of classrooms needed. I am first and foremost for adequate appropriations through a Federal grant-in-aid program for school construction. That is why I have introduced a bill similar to that introduced by Congressmen CLEVELAND BAILEY and CARROLL KEARNS, H. R. 2612.

The bill that I am introducing today, if enacted, is not intended as a substitute for any Federal program of grants-in-aid to the States for school construction but as an additional and supplementary means of enabling the States and local communities to carry out school-construction programs which might not otherwise be possible in meeting their school capital outlay requirements. The program under my bill would be administered in conjunction with other programs of Federal assistance to States seeking to meet their school-construction needs.

If adequate funds are not made available under a grant-in-aid act for school-construction purposes, then, I believe, my supplemental Federal-loan proposal can be of very definite value.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I realize that this Congress has many pressing problems and that a first-term Member will be well advised to do a great deal more listening than talking.

For that reason I have voluntarily limited my request this afternoon to address the House for only 15 minutes.

I do believe, however, that in our understandable preoccupation with the difficult decisions of world affairs, some of which were placed in our hands a few minutes ago by our President, we run the risk of overlooking certain dangerous developments if they are not called to our attention.

One of the finest activities of our entire Government, Mr. Speaker, and one which I am convinced is absolutely essential to our ultimate survival as a Nation, is in jeopardy of being destroyed.

A subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has officially recommended that the field activities of our Federal soil conservation program be discontinued.

The panel proposes that the responsibility for sending these trained field technicians out to the grassroots, at the forks of the creek, where they can actually help the American farmer save our soil, be simply turned over to the various States to accept or ignore as they may individually see fit.

I find it difficult to conceive of a more costly or a more disastrous move. My purpose in bringing it to the attention of the Congress at this time, Mr. Speaker, is in the hope that we may be forewarned and alerted in time to stop it.

It is my understanding that, under the provisions of the Executive Reorganization Act, the whole Commission, if it approves this monstrous mistake, could simply submit it to the Congress and it would automatically become law unless we should pass a resolution of express disapproval within 60 days.

Now, concerning the proposal itself, Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss three points as briefly as I can.

First of all, I would like to demonstrate that this Federal soil-conservation program is a rightful national responsibility and one that we simply dare not ignore or shunt off to some other unit of government.

Secondly, I am convinced that turning it over lock, stock, and barrel to the 48 States would be to turn back the clock

and immeasurably weaken this vital program.

Finally, I would like to say that the work of our Soil Conservation Service is yielding us the very best return on our tax dollar of just about any activity in our entire Federal Government.

I

Protecting the soil of our country can be nothing less than a national responsibility. Our Nation's potential productive might depends upon it.

The two most indispensable natural resources of ours or any civilization are the most ordinary and the most necessary—the cheapest and the most priceless commodities of all—the water that falls from the skies and the soil that lies under our feet.

Each year, the rivers of our country carry to the sea more than a million foot-acres of this good, rich soil which is the lifeblood of our people—a treasure of greater intrinsic worth than all the gold that is stored at Fort Knox, Ky.

Man can never replace it, and the best he can do is to install practices designed to hold what is left and arrest its untimely flight.

This the farmers of our land have been striving to accomplish, aided by the invaluable scientific know-how of the field technicians of our Federal Soil Conservation Service.

Yet theirs is a fight against time. We are losing our irreplaceable topsoil to erosion at the rate of one-sixteenth inch each year.

For 20 years, we have been making progress. It has been a slow and agonizing task, to be sure. The present rate of applying soil-conservation practices to the land amounts to only about 3 percent of the Nation's croplands annually. At least, we have been moving in the right direction.

The exigencies of our time demand that the program be speeded up, not slowed down.

Ours is a rapidly growing population with no great land frontiers remaining. The food and fiber needs of our people require more and ever more productive acres of land.

Every evening when the American people sit down to dinner, there are 6,200 more of us needing to be served than on the day before.

By 1975, according to a publication issued last year by our House Committee on Agriculture, we shall need the production equivalent of an additional 115 million acres of cropland to keep pace with the national demand.

Even to approach this goal, the per acre yield of our land shall have to be very substantially increased. This cannot be done with a weakened soil-conservation program.

It is a well-established medical fact that foodstuffs grown on eroded land lack the vitamins and nutrients necessary to physical health and growth. Impoverished land produces impoverished people.

This is a matter of pressing concern not only to the farmer but to every city dweller in the land whose children seek nourishment in the products of our American farms.

Our modern genius for transportation and marketing make this an unavoid-

able Federal responsibility, when most of the food consumed from American tables was produced in other States.

What happens to the soil of Idaho is important to Texas, and what happens to the Texas grazing lands has a very vital effect for the people of New England.

The problem cannot be divided into 48 compartments, and neither can the solution.

II

Secondly, I think it is obvious that shifting these responsibilities to the States would mean a long step backward in the work we have so painstakingly begun.

It is not a question of whether the States should assume a greater responsibility in saving our land. It is a question of whether we in the Federal Government should abdicate our responsibility.

It is, further, a question of just what some States can do and what others will do.

The record speaks for itself. This problem has been with us for many years, and there has been an almost unlimited field of work for the States to undertake.

Yet, while a few enlightened States have made significant contributions to the effort, 13 States still appropriate nothing whatever for assistance to their soil-conservation districts at the grass-roots.

I am wholly in sympathy with the idea that many functions of government can best be performed at the local and State levels to reduce, insofar as possible, the people's dependence upon Federal authority.

But to speed up the impoverishment of the earth from which our whole economy must be sustained would inevitably and unavoidably reduce the people to an even greater reliance upon the Federal Government.

In many things decentralization is a worthy aim. But the soil-conservation program is today the most thoroughly decentralized activity of our Government. It is actually run by the farmers themselves in local districts of their own creation, and the Federal technical staff serves them at their call.

The result of dismantling the service would be not decentralization, but disintegration.

In a day when we speak of \$100 billion for highways, all the 48 States combined provided only a bit over \$2 million last year to save our soil for future generations.

Indeed, the States should be encouraged to apply more of their financial resources to this significant program. But such increased interest should be in addition to, rather than in place of, the pittance our National Government is providing.

III

Finally, I want to stress that any temporary saving which might result from the proposed abandonment of our Federal grass-roots program would be the height of false economy.

In cold dollars and cents, it would be infinitely more costly to us in the long run.

The present worth of the farm lands of our Nation is estimated at \$85 billion—2,361 times what we are spending to save those lands.

The market value of the produce raised last year, even with a searing drought, was 700 times the trifle we invest in holding the land where it is. One-seventh of 1 percent is the cheapest rate of interest I can imagine.

The total tax cost of the present Federal program to the average citizen is only 35 cents a year, or less than 3 cents a month.

Surely if economy is our aim, there are far better places to cut. For our Nation expends no money more wisely than this trifle it invests in soil conservation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to commend the gentleman for his position on this matter, and say to him that we consider the topsoil on the American farms today the second greatest national asset we have, second only to the resources of our boys and girls.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman and quite agree with him.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on his speech because I think he has touched on a subject that should be in the minds of all of us as we start this session, and that we should give consideration to the very things he has pointed out so clearly and so forcefully. I think he has rendered a real service to the House and to the country in bringing this matter to our attention at this time.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am grateful for those remarks.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join my good friend from Texas in his views and join the gentleman from West Virginia in commending the gentleman from Texas on his eloquent speech in behalf of the soil-conservation program. As has been stated, I think he has rendered a great service to the Nation, because when you serve the farmers and conserve the soil of our country you do indeed serve the country well. I join in the commendation of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to point out in closing, if I may, that after 20 long years of intense activity on the present budget, only 22 percent of our farms have been planned for soil and water conservation.

In testimony before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, the spokesman for the service gave the following statement:

This is a 33-year program. Farmers have indicated their desire to speed up the program. Their interest is high; their cooperation is increasing; and they are now ready to go ahead with the needed jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the national welfare demands that this work be speeded up, not slowed down.

It took nature a million years to build a single inch of topsoil. We are depleting it at the rate of one-sixteenth inch each year. Thus, in a meager 16 years, we are denuding the earth of a million years of nature's labor.

This land of ours is a good heritage. Yet one cannot help wondering, more practically than philosophically, how long we can continue so rapaciously exploiting and so rapidly exhausting this basic gift of God.

I sometimes think a timely message for our people was written some 3,400 years ago. It appears in the eighth chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy:

For the Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness . . . whose stones are iron and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass. When thou hast eaten and art full, then thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which He hath given thee.

And it shall be, if thou do at all forget . . . I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations which the Lord destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish.

May ours be the wisdom not to despoil this heritage in our time, but to pass it on enriched and improved to the future.

TELEVISION COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss today the increasingly important question of televising public hearings of the committees of the House of Representatives.

Last Thursday I introduced in the House, House Resolution 99, to amend the rules of the House with respect to committee proceedings. That resolution included a provision which will clearly give committees, at their discretion, the right to permit live or recorded telecasts and broadcasts of their public proceedings.

That question is important and timely. Just last week we completed the assignment of Members to committees. Presumably in the next few days those committees will meet and arrange their internal organization, including the creation of subcommittees and the adoption of procedural rules. Whether committees will be permitted to broadcast or televise their committee hearings must be settled at the beginning of this Congress.

From statements made in response to parliamentary inquiry, it appears to be the opinion of the Speaker that the Rules of the House do not authorize televising or broadcasting of committee hearings. My review of the House rules and precedents would lead me to an opposite conclusion. Apparently the minority leader, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., likewise is of the opinion that commit-

tees presently have the power to authorize telecasts of their proceedings since it was permitted during the 83d Congress.

My interpretation of the rules is of little consequence since for all practical purposes the Speaker's interpretation is the final word unless the House itself acts in one way or another.

Because House rules nowhere expressly prohibit telecasts and broadcasts of committee proceedings, and this issue seems to be, in the words of former Speaker MARTIN, "in the twilight zone," I suggest that the House and its Rules Committee give consideration to this question early in the session and resolve the issue once and for all, clearly and expressly, by amending the Rules of the House. Those who are interested in all that appears in the precedents of the House can find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 1, pages 1334-1335.

I should add at this point that earlier in the session today I propounded a parliamentary inquiry, and of course there will be further comments on this question in the RECORD of today.

Although I disagree with it, I do not think any useful purpose would be served on this occasion in analyzing and discussing the conclusion of the Speaker. In announcing his opinion in February of 1952 that the rules of the House do not now permit committees to televise and broadcast their proceedings, the Speaker said:

If the House adopts a rule, the Chair will abide by and enforce it as he does all the rules of the House of Representatives.

On that same occasion Minority Leader MARTIN, Speaker of the House in the 83d Congress, said:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that this is a twilight zone which has not been clearly defined as to just what authority the Speaker might have, and I think we should at the earliest possible moment have some definite rule established.

Later Mr. MARTIN also said:

I think television and broadcasting is here to stay and will probably increase in popularity as the days go by. For that reason, we should have revision of the rules to define authority.

Mr. Speaker, this subject is not new in interest to me. I first offered a resolution providing for the telecasting of committee hearings on February 27, 1952. That resolution was House Resolution 540 in the 82d Congress. I discussed the subject at some length on the floor of the House of Representatives in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 2, pages 1567-1571.

In the 83d Congress on May 17, 1954, I introduced House Resolution 550, to amend the rules of the House, which is identical with House Resolution 99, which I introduced in the 84th Congress last week. In the discussion of House Resolution 550, I incorporated references to previous remarks made and testimony given before congressional committees. These appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 5, pages 6779-6780.

Mr. Speaker, I now desire to turn to considerations of public policy, which, in my judgment, ought to impel the Rules

Committee and the House to give express authorization to committees to permit telecasting and broadcasting of their public proceedings.

I will first state certain general propositions on which I think there should be no disagreement. I will then argue that those propositions lead logically to the reform in the rules which I advocate.

First, television and radio broadcasting, although new, have already established themselves as effective means for the transmission of news.

Second, self-government by citizens through elected representatives can work successfully in modern, complex society only if, first, the electorate is well and accurately informed about the public business; and second, the performance of their elected representatives is well known to the voters.

Third, under our Constitution, the policymaking or legislative authority of the Government is vested primarily in the Congress.

Fourth, the executive branch of the Government, under the Constitution, has a part in policy formulation through recommending measures and through the power of veto. As a practical matter, however, the bureaus and departments have a far greater influence on the character of legislation than the American public realizes. That influence is exerted through the drafting of technical provisions in bills, through reporting on measures customarily referred to them by legislative committees for comment and through pressures on committees and individual legislators of one kind and another.

Fifth, in the contest between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government over the relative influence of the one or the other in the formulation of national policy the sympathies and the support of voting citizens is controlling. To preserve the constitutional power and prerogatives of the Congress in policymaking, the respect, the understanding, and the support of the public is necessary.

Sixth, familiarity with the problems of the House of Representatives, the manner in which they are met, the functioning of committees in the process of enacting laws, plus acquaintance with the individual members of the House, all will lead to the sympathetic knowledge and understanding on the part of the American public, so necessary in upholding the legislative prerogatives of the House.

Seventh, of all the media for the transmission of news, first-hand observance through live or recorded television and radio broadcasting is the most powerful and effective. Through them the functioning of the House of Representatives and its committees can be brought into the homes of the American people in a way never possible before. Through television and radio, government can be brought closer to the people.

Eighth, if we deny the American people the opportunity to witness the Congress in action firsthand, if we draw, as it were, a translucent curtain between the people and the conduct of public affairs, we will do two things: First, we will prevent the electorate from becoming

ing as well informed on public matters as it would be if it could observe them through television and radio broadcasting. Second, the House of Representatives will suffer in public notice and consequently in public esteem. Any product or service which is not brought to the attention of the public is soon forgotten. With the executive branch of the Government and other legislative bodies continually in the limelight, the House, if it excludes itself from the public gaze, will be relegated to a position of inferior importance in the public regard.

Mr. Speaker, it has been argued that telecasting and broadcasting committee hearings will lead to demagoguery and showmanship on the part of Members seeking the spotlight. I am not one who would argue that Representatives are free from such human frailties. But I venture to suggest that any tendencies in that direction will be no different than they are now in the absence of television and radio at committee hearings. I do not believe that telecasting or broadcasting committee hearings can convert a statesman into a demagogue. I also venture to suggest that the public will be quick to sense and resent cheap tactics on the part of a Member of Congress; that the reaction on the guilty Member would be unfavorable to him.

I predict also that instead of encouraging demagoguery, superficiality and showmanship the knowledge that he was under the eyes of many American citizens in all walks of life would have a tendency to sober anyone having such tendencies. Actually, radio and television can only improve the quality of legislative performance. That will be particularly true as the American public, through the use of television and radio, becomes more and more familiar with the operations of the House of Representatives and the public problems with which it deals.

Mr. Speaker, overriding any of the considerations I have mentioned is the right of the American people to be informed fully about their business. I, for one, shall not stand in the way of more complete and more accurate knowledge on the part of an electorate which, after all, is the ultimate sovereign in our system of Government.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. I wish to inquire a little as to the operation of the gentleman's resolution. Are we to understand that the sessions of the House of Representatives will be televised, as for example, the session today?

Mr. MEADER. Let me say in reply to the gentleman's question that my resolution, House Resolution 99, does not refer

to the House of Representatives; it has reference only to committees. The language is to be found on page 2 of the resolution and reads as follows:

Each committee is authorized, in its discretion, upon such terms and conditions as it deems advisable, to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of its proceedings by radio and television, and the dissemination of news of such proceedings by other methods and media of communication.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. Will the gentleman tell the House whether or not there is any reason in fact or philosophical approach as to why the gentleman in his resolution includes only the televising of committee hearings and apparently excludes the television of sessions of the House of Representatives?

Mr. MEADER. In answer to the gentleman's question, the reason that I have related this only to committee hearings is because the entire resolution deals with procedural rules of committees. I have not sought in this resolution to deal with conduct in the Chamber of the House of Representatives itself. I know that in a previous Congress the gentleman from New York, Mr. Javits, who has left us to become attorney general of the State of New York, strongly advocated the telecasting of proceedings in the House of Representatives.

My own understanding of the rules with respect to the Chamber itself is that the question of televising House proceedings is largely under the control of the Speaker of the House. We presently do have telecasts and radio broadcasts of joint sessions of the Congress to hear Presidential messages, and we also have had live radio and television broadcasts of joint meetings of the House and Senate where we have heard the address of some representative of a foreign government. I understand that telecasting is done by permission of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Carrying the thought further, then, as a projected plan of operation of the gentleman's resolution, would it not ultimately result in the committee itself within its own committee rules providing specific authorization necessary for that particular committee or its subcommittees to negotiate in order that radio or television coverage might be possible?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is correct. As the gentleman knows, since we both serve on the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, in connection with the rules of that committee in the 83d Congress, there was considerable discussion over the terms upon which committees and subcommittees could compel a witness to testify if the proceedings were being broadcast or telecast. I envision this problem would be dealt with by the committee as the occasion might arise. It would be difficult to come each time to the House to get a ruling, or to the

Speaker to get a ruling, particularly when the question might arise in the midst of a committee hearing.

Mr. BROWNSON. May I suggest that the gentleman from Michigan has prepared what in my opinion is a very fine analysis of this particular situation. May I say further that he has had unusual experience as a staff member of committees and as staff counsel of an important committee, as well as a member of at least two important committees of the House of Representatives during his tenure of service here. To me he has approached the whole situation very orderly; it is very logical and it merits my own detailed consideration.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

May I say further that this question obviously is one that needs to be settled clearly by the House itself. The present Speaker in this Congress today and in the 82d Congress in February 1952 unequivocally and clearly stated that committees did not presently have the authority to disseminate news of their proceedings by either radio or television.

In the 83d Congress, without any express ruling, Speaker MARTIN took the position that the committees presently had that authority, and that it would be within the jurisdiction of the various committees to permit or not to permit the taking of pictures, the presence of news reporters, the presence of television apparatus, or the presence of moving-picture newsreel cameras. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has told me that he took that position although no formal ruling was requested by parliamentary inquiry.

Now, since two Speakers about the same time have different interpretations about the rules of the House, it seems to me that there must be enough question about the meaning of the rules so that it could be clarified clearly and a policy established once and for all by the Committee on Rules and the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Could I just ask one question in relation to this bill? Would this imply that the committee would have the authority to pick and choose that part of the committee hearings that should be released for publication? For instance, I notice that today the press conferences of the President of the United States are released on television but they are released only after they are edited by the President's staff. Would the committee have the same right under this bill?

Mr. MEADER. My answer to the gentleman is, yes. I would not want television and radio reporting to be authorized beyond the power of the committee to police it, because the committee should continually have control of its proceedings and should not permit distortion. I personally would be opposed to any commercial tinge upon a telecast or broadcasting of a committee hearing, and I think the committee should retain editorial control over its proceedings and its record.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a ranking member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I informed my colleagues of the House of Representatives that I intended to take whatever action was necessary to avert any delay in the prompt consideration of pay increases for Federal and postal employees.

I do not intend to stand idly by and permit dilatory practices similar to those used in connection with our last year's hearings to again use up so much time that Congress will not have sufficient time in which to consider and enact a fair and equitable pay raise which our Federal and postal workers sorely need and justly deserve. I might add, also, that my idea of a fair pay raise is not one of 5 percent but rather one of 10 percent. The Federal and postal employees of my district in Detroit, and many throughout the United States know the stand I have taken in their behalf, and I want to reassure them at this time that I shall continue to fight for their rights, because I believe that they, as part of our great general public, are more entitled to consideration by this administration than General Motors.

I have noted with interest that certain Republican Members, who last year voted against even a niggardly 5-percent pay raise, have now come out for a 10-percent pay increase. I have further been informed that their motive for so doing is that they realize that we Democrats will see that our Federal friends are given fair treatment, despite whatever course of action the Republican leadership may choose to take. Therefore they want to climb on the bandwagon and share part of the credit for finally enacting a pay raise that could have easily been passed last year, but for their Republican leadership, who arbitrarily tacked on a postage rate increase bill and took the unreasonable stand that one should not become law without the other. No doubt this unreasonable, unyielding position is one important reason why we once again find a Democratic majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I was pleased to learn that a great number of the Democratic Members of the other body have likewise indicated that prompt consideration will be given to this all-important pay-increase legislation. These statements were undoubtedly motivated by the same reasons as mine is—to make certain that we can give proper consideration to and pass into law an equitable pay raise for our deserving Federal and postal workers irrespective of whatever adverse action might be taken by the administration.

I intend to push for prompt action on pay legislation just as soon as the routine internal business of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend my remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TABER.

Mr. BOGGS and include a minority report signed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] and himself.

Mr. DODD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SELDEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of California and include a magazine article.

Mr. LANE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCOTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO and to include an address by the distinguished Assistant Secretary of State, Henry F. Holland.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include a magazine article.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. McVEY.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAILLIARD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHORT and to include the ceremonies held in connection with the christening of the U. S. S. *Forrestal*.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include a speech he made yesterday.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. PROST (at the request of Mr. METCALF), on account of death in immediate family.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), today, in order to attend a funeral.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution favoring temporary permission for parking on square 723 of the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 18, 1955:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

On January 21, 1955:

H. R. 2091. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

301. A letter from the adjutant general, national headquarters, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 56th National Encampment, United Spanish War Veterans, held in San Antonio, Tex., September 19 to 23, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

302. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the wheat-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

303. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

304. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

305. A letter from the Director, National Headquarters, Selective Service System, transmitting the fourth report of the operations of the Selective Service System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to section 10 (g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

306. A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting Report No. 8 prepared by Federal Facilities Corporation, the operating agency, with respect to its expenditures for repairs, replacements, additions, improvements, or maintenance of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities during the 5-month period for fiscal 1955 ending November 30, 1954, pursuant to section 15 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (87 Stat. 408); to the Committee on Armed Services.

307. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 29th Quarterly Report required under the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

308. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

309. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and

for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

310. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on House Administration.

311. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report on the Operations of Civil Aeronautics, pursuant to Public Law 867, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

312. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of November 30, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act, as amended July 16, 1952 (Public Law 554); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

313. A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for plant and equipment, including acquisition or condemnation of real property or facilities, and plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, for the atomic energy program"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

314. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, "A bill to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

315. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by various subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

316. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting 36 separate reports received from the Departments of the Army and Air Force covering 45 specific violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1 entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

317. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report covering the professional and scientific positions established in the Department of Defense for the calendar year ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

318. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

319. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

320. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

321. A letter from the Chairman, Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission, transmitting a recommended program for disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities and related equipment, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Rubber Produc-

ing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 (Public Law 205, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2800. A bill providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2801. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2802. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2803. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 2804. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2805. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2806. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2807. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide a permanent procedure for adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis, to regulate the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2808. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 2809. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2810. A bill to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compen-

sation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2811. A bill for the relief of the city of Gallatin, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2812. A bill to modify the comprehensive plans for the improvement of the Cumberland River and tributaries to provide for the inclusion in such plans for the payment of \$37,740 to the city of Gallatin, Tenn., for the cost to such city of the construction of additional water system facilities necessitated by the raising of the water level of the Cumberland River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 2813. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2814. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the punishment of any individual who travels in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for indecent molestation of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 2815. A bill to encourage equity investments through tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2816. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 2817. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 2818. A bill to establish a Council on Juvenile Delinquency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 2819. A bill to authorize purchase of a portion of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas, to finance the early development by it of the water resources of the Brazos River Basin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2820. A bill to amend section 4521 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to prevent a contraction of the tax base from which Federal revenues are derived; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2821. A bill to amend section 13 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the exemption from the child-labor provisions of such act of certain employees employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2822. A bill to amend section 2 (a) (7) of the Social Security Act to provide that, in determining the need of an individual for old-age assistance under a State plan, the first \$50 per month of such individual's earned income shall be disregarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2823. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 2824. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2825. A bill to establish a Commission on Programs for the Aging; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2826. A bill to increase the rates and amounts of compensation which may be

earned by retired commissioned officers when employed by the United States, and to provide that such rates and amounts shall increase or decrease as the level of prices increases or decreases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2827. A bill to provide an equitable adjustment for retirement pay of naval and Marine Corps officers commissioned from the enlisted ranks; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2828. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 and the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 to provide for lump-sum payments to certain beneficiaries under those acts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2829. A bill to authorize the sale of certain property of the United States to the Georgia Institute of Technology; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2830. A bill for the relief of the cities of Lebanon and Gallatin, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2831. A bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 2832. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Army of land allocated for cottage-site development in reservoir areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 2833. A bill to amend the provisions of law added to the United States Code by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong., 67 Stat. 588); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2834. A bill to modify the comprehensive plan for the improvement of the Cumberland River and tributaries to provide for the inclusion in such plans for the payment of specific amounts to certain cities for the construction of additional water-system facilities necessitated by the raising of the water level of the Cumberland River as a result of the construction of the Old Hickory lock and dam project; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2835. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide for the review of claims for compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2836. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 2837. A bill to provide for a pay increase for postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain tuition payments be treated as charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2839. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 2840. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2841. A bill to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 2842. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to indemnify farmers for damages to fruit trees caused by hurricanes in 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 2844. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of old-age insurance benefits to certain disabled individuals who are under 65 years of age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 2845. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 2846. A bill for the establishment of a commission on organization of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2847. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the discharge and continuing deferment of certain persons of exceptional scientific, technical, and engineering ability or aptitude; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2848. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 2849. A bill to grant to certain State agencies control over the allocation and expenditure of certain Federal appropriations made to carry out the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2850. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which among other things prohibit price discriminations; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2851. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2852. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2853. A bill to defray traveling expenses of relatives of United States nationals

held as prisoners of war by foreign powers, in connection with visits to places of such imprisonment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2854. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 2855. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2856. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2857. A bill to provide for a program of Federal loans to assist States and local communities in building schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 2858. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 2859. A bill to provide that the fluid-milk program for schools established by section 201c of the Agricultural Act of 1949 shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2860. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 2861. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2862. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2863. A bill to provide that pensions for non-service-connected death shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II and Korean veterans under the same conditions as apply to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 2864. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2865. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 2866. A bill to declare the waterway (a section of the Acushnet River) north of the Coggeshall Street Bridge in Massachusetts a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2867. A bill to increase the monthly rates of pension payable to widows and former widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 2868. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide that veterans may continue to accrue the benefits provided by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, until individuals may no longer be inducted for training and service in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2870. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2871. A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 2872. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to relieve innocent purchasers of certain fungible goods from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2873. A bill to authorize purchase of a portion of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas, to finance the early development by it of the water resources of the Brazos River Basin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2874. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which persons may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2875. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2876. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 2877. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 2878. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of single persons, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2879. A bill to provide for tax refunds in certain cases where it has been determined that an unlawful collection has been made; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2880. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Racine County Rifle Range, Wis., to the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 2881. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 2882. A bill to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Planor No. 877 at Baytown, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 2883. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2884. A bill to amend section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2885. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2886. A bill to further amend the act of September 9, 1950, by extending until July 1, 1957, the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 2887. A bill to exempt the retirement income and pensions of members of the Armed Forces who are under the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

H. R. 2888. A bill to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, and the methods for its prevention and control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WITTHROW:

H. R. 2889. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Necedah, Wis., to the village of Necedah; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2890. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2891. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to amend section 84 (a) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to establish a commission on utilization of manpower in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Information, Intelligence, and Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army to confer with certain municipal officials and others to work out a method of preventing certain lake levels from dropping excessively because of the use of hydroelectric generators; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of the organization and operation of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of juvenile delinquency in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 101. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate and study the desirability and feasibility of establishing an island prison for the confinement of persons convicted of crimes involving disloyalty; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 102. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. Res. 103. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of juvenile delinquency in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEAMER: Resolution of the Senate of the Indiana General Assembly urging the location and establishment of a harbor and port along the shore of Lake Michigan in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly urging the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Secretary of Defense of the United States to reappraise manpower policy No. 4 to the end that Rhode Island may receive its fair share of defense contracts so-called; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly urging the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the Tariff Commission to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles, including lace, jewelry, and rubber goods imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to prevent the closing of the Murphy General Hospital in Waltham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution 5, requesting that the Secretary of Defense rescind his order that the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., be closed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Joint Resolution 2, requesting that the Secretary of Defense rescind his order that the Army and Navy

Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark., be closed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation increasing the personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a concurrent resolution approved by the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, entitled "Concurrent resolution to condemn the aggression which is being inflicted to democracy in Costa Rica, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 2892. A bill for the relief of Marcelino C. Hortizuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 2893. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2894. A bill for the relief of Angelo John Maroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2895. A bill for the relief of Ahti Johannes Ruuskanen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of Elisabetta Marie Cocco, Riccardo Cocco, and Laura Cocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2897. A bill for the relief of Chung Poik Cha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of F. Delizia Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2899. A bill for the relief of Eugenio (also known as Eugene) Cataldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2900. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Gallagher, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 2901. A bill for the relief of Elmer George Reitmeyer and Johanna Mary Reitmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Andrew Trittner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Olindo Balboni, Mrs. Gisella Balboni, and Piero Balboni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Sydney Eric Barnett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Luigi Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2907. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2908. A bill for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2909. A bill to amend Private Law 498, 83d Congress, so as to allow payment of

agent's or attorney's fees out of the amounts appropriated thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2910. A bill for the relief of Osman Demir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2911. A bill for the relief of Max Steinsapir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 2912. A bill for the relief of Morl Blustein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Piotr Kowalczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Juan Pedro Garay-Muro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 2915. A bill to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the grade of General of the Armies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Alexander D. Ramati and Gerda Ramati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of Fa Hsiang Wu, George Kuosing Wu, Chin Chung Yu, Lan Sing Wu, and Fu Sing Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Anton and Rosanda (Rosana) Jugo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Vera Suhrawardy and Oleg-Jerry Calder and Gleb Zahid Suhrawardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Rosy Juin Tseng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Barry Maurice Clines and Margaret Linsley Clines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Edward Abbey Kornitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2924. A bill for the relief of David J. Daze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Rodriguez Perez, also known as Carmelo Rodriguez Fenald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2926. A bill for the relief of George Huppert and Marta Huppert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2927. A bill for the relief of Mary Keane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2928. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Bentley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Lazara Camargo Bernoudy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of June Beatrice Simmons Hightower Darling (nee Arron), alias Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2931. A bill for the relief of Gina Bellagamba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2932. A bill for the relief of John H. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2934. A bill for the relief of Maria Pizzarello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 2935. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Ray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2936. A bill for the relief of Clifford Oesterle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2937. A bill for the relief of Karel Aloys Kase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 2938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Javier (formerly Maria Alvarado Sala); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2939. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2940. A bill for the relief of H. O. Schundler and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2942. A bill for the relief of Umberto Randaccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Ami and Malka Hadary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of Joan Frances Feeley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 2946. A bill for the relief of Eugene Dus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2947. A bill for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of William Joseph Perella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 2949. A bill for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 2950. A bill for the relief of Maximo C. Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2951. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Hankel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2952. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 2953. A bill for the relief of Judy Anne Marie Burton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 2954. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2955. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2956. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2957. A bill for the relief of Elli Anna Maria Cirillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2958. A bill for the relief of Victoriana Arellano Berincua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2959. A bill for the relief of Dieter Wolfgang Kaisenberg (also known as William Prieb); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 2960. A bill for the relief of Amadea Avanzado and Gil Avanzado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 2961. A bill for the relief of Fuh Yu Yang (John F. Y. Yang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Petition of Boston, Mass., City Council, opposing the closing of the Murphy General Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

62. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Racine, Wis., to urge its elected Representatives to support any legislation the purpose of which is to institute and complete the deepening and improving of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes, with particular reference to the Detroit

River, Lake St. Clair, the St. Marys River, and some shoal spots in the Straits of Mackinac; to the Committee on Public Works.

63. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harold Hillenbrand, D. D. S., secretary, American Dental Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the association's interest in providing additional resources in support of the program of the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. Also, petition of Charles Telfan, Raiford, Fla., relative to the case of *Charles Telfan v. The United States of America*, relating to a redress of grievance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Minority Report on Investigation by Special Campaigns Committee in Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 439, 2d session, 83d Congress, created a special Committee To Investigate the Election of the Members to the House of Representatives of the 84th Congress. By the terms of the resolution the committee expired with the end of the 83d Congress.

The majority report of the committee was filed on January 1, 1955. At that time I was in my home district of Louisiana and did not have an opportunity to examine the report prior to its being filed.

The report was not signed by myself or by Representative FRANK KARSTEN of Missouri. We were the minority members of the committee. The committee having expired, there is no procedure whereby a minority report may be attached to the majority report. Representative KARSTEN and I are using this means of publishing the report which we would have filed. It follows in full:

MINORITY REPORT ON INVESTIGATION BY SPECIAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE IN NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Ordinarily we would not issue a minority report concerning the procedure followed by the Campaign Expenditures Committee in its investigations and hearings. But we are particularly concerned with the report issued relative to the investigation conducted in the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina. This report, plus various and sundry press releases, issued in the name of the committee has, in our opinion, created in the minds of the voters of that district widespread misconceptions and we think the record should be set straight.

In our opinion neither the hearings nor the investigations were warranted.

The hearings demonstrated the soundness of the rule previously adopted by this committee that only complaints filed under oath in writing by either the victorious or the defeated candidate for Congress would be

considered. This rule was neither adopted nor followed in the 83d Congress. The soundness of such a requirement is obvious. Without it complaints, by crackpots and others, could undoubtedly be filed in all of the congressional districts of our country.

In the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina the committee never had a complaint in writing from either the winner or the loser in the congressional race. The only complaint was that filed by the Republican organization of North Carolina. At the time that complaint was filed we took the position that it involved the election laws of the State of North Carolina. (We are not authorities on the election laws of North Carolina, although we did learn a few things about them while there.) At the most it seemed to us that what was indicated was action by the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, amending, if necessary, the North Carolina absentee ballot laws, but in no instance was Federal legislation or Federal election laws involved. Throughout the existence of our Republic the States have zealously guarded their rights to determine election procedures.

We most certainly condemn the violation of any election laws. The privilege of voting is the greatest heritage that the American people enjoy. A man who stultifies that right or seeks to buy or sell a vote or stuff the ballot box is a criminal. Nevertheless the net effect of 3 days of hearings in North Carolina simply confirm our original conviction that the election laws of North Carolina must be determined by the representatives of that State acting in their own legislature. The investigative rights of Congress ought never to be used as a weapon to accomplish the desires of a political party in any locality because that party at the moment happens to be the majority party in the Congress of the United States.

It appears to us that one of the main objectives of the Republican Party in North Carolina was to create doubt in the minds of the voters on the soundness of the North Carolina election laws, particularly those sections dealing with absentee voting in that State. These laws may very well need changing. We are not prepared to say yes or no. We do feel, however, that it is not the function of this committee to dictate to the Legislature of North Carolina.

In its effort to justify its expedition into the Ninth District, reckless and greatly exaggerated statements were made by members of the staff of the committee during and after the hearings. Cases were presented to the committee without adequate preparation, some of which had no bearing whatsoever on the congressional election. Frequently only one side of a case was presented to the committee. Several cases were presented as illegal which were not so. The alleged irregularities were magnified by the staff of the committee. A careful check

of all of the irregularities has been made. On the basis of the testimony before the committee it is doubtful that more than a dozen or two votes would have been changed had there been a complete recount in the district. That could hardly be called gross irregularities in a district which casts from 70,000 to as many as 130,000 votes. In the November 2, 1954, election, approximately 100,000 votes were cast.

In order to clarify the above conclusions we deem it necessary that we here review in brief the evidence in the record county by county.

Alexander: Evidence was presented to the committee that 14 absentee ballots were voted prior to the date of issuance of the ballots with further evidence that the office of the chairman of the board of elections erroneously failed to enter the dates when the applications were received and when the ballots were sent out. There was some controversy about challenges by Republicans and some misunderstanding of the law of North Carolina relating thereto on the part of the election officials. There was some evidence that an invalid woman received \$7 for voting. This was denied by her sister who was there. In another matter brought before the committee there was hearsay testimony that someone voted an absentee ballot for a lady without her knowledge. From the evidence there was a misunderstanding between the Democratic and Republican members of the board of elections as to just who could see the election records with evidence that the Republican member at one time had illegal possession of part of the records. There was no showing that any candidate was prejudiced by what transpired.

Alleghany: Three cases were erroneously brought before the committee, all of which concerned residence qualifications under the North Carolina law. Had counsel for the committee prepared his cases adequately and had he checked the North Carolina law, he would have found that each of the voters were duly qualified under the law and that there was no irregularity from this county.

Ashe: There was evidence with affidavits and counter affidavits that an invalid man 80 years old, who was forgetful, stated he didn't vote his own absentee ballot. Yet there was evidence that his son accompanied the notary public at the time the father voted the ballot.

There was evidence presented that the ballots for one precinct were not properly guarded. In one case a newspaper reporter and others offered conflicting evidence as to whether or not 2 or 3 aged invalid ladies, who did not appear before the committee when subpoenaed, had not received their ballots by mail. No prejudice was shown from this county to any candidate.

Cabarrus: Evidence that one registrar left books in custody of clerk with instructions to contact him if anyone desired to present

any challenges and that this was not done on that day but the next day the registrar heard the challenges.

Caldwell: Nothing was presented to the committee concerning this county.

Rowan: Nothing was presented to the committee concerning this county.

Stanley: Evidence given by a 45-year-old son, who couldn't read or write, that "X" mark on absentee ballots of father, who couldn't read or write, and who died on night of election was not the "X" of the father.

Watauga: Evidence was offered that the chairman of board of elections failed at one time to let the Republican member of board see election records. Evidence was presented by a Republican watcher who kept a record of people who voted that more votes were turned in in one precinct than had actually voted, but no more for congressional candidates than she had written in her book. No prejudice to any candidate was shown from this county.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that at no time during the hearings were there any indications of any nature that either candidate for Congress participated in any fashion in any of the alleged irregularities. Our own conclusions are that the Legislature of North Carolina should make a thorough study of the election laws of that State and take whatever action is deemed necessary in the premises. We reiterate the inadvisability of congressional committees concerning themselves with matters which should be left to the respective States.

HALE BOGGS.

FRANK KARSTEN.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my statement of January 22, 1955, commemorating the anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, OF MARYLAND, COMMEMORATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

January 22 is the day set aside for the traditional observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. Since 1918 this memorable day in the history of man's struggle against oppression has been a reminder to us, both of the atheistic dictatorial forces at large in our world and equally as important, the unbounded zeal of the Ukrainian people to attain the freedom and liberty for which they have so long aspired.

We, in America, together with the other free peoples of the world, are the present keepers of the flame of freedom—man's undying will to live in peace and friendship with his fellowman in accordance with the principles of God. As we enjoy these blessings, we cannot and we will not forget the freedom-loving people of the world who are not free, those who cherish liberty, but who must live without it, and those whose offer of a faith and charity to their neighbors is scorned by godless dictators whose thoughts

and ambitions are of world domination and slavery for mankind rather than the protection of the inalienable rights of the individual.

No people have been more heroic, nor fought more bravely against countless odds for liberty and freedom than the Ukrainian people. We in America are not unmindful of their present plight nor of our solemn obligation to them. On this anniversary, we hail the free spirit of Ukraina and renew our pledges of the past to continue to seek the means by which they can throw off the oppressor's yoke and walk with us as a free people.

Increase in Cotton Acreage Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a measure—H. R. 2438—which, if enacted into law, will increase the national acreage allotment for the 1955 crop of cotton to 19,500,000 acres.

The Secretary of Agriculture, under existing legislation, has set the 1955 allotment at 18,113,208 acres which compares with the 1953 acreage of 25,151,400 and a 1954 acreage allotment of 21,379,358.

I have introduced this legislation, and urge its early passage, because many of the cotton farmers of my district and State are already in very bad financial circumstances due to last year's crop failure caused by a disastrous drought.

The cotton farmers of America have demonstrated time and time again their willingness to cooperate in a nationwide program which enables them to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demands. They know, as I do, that if we are to have a price-support program, we must also have acreage quotas. Yet, I believe that under certain conditions it may be unwise to reduce surpluses in certain years as drastically as they have been in others. I believe that 1955 is a year, certainly in the district I represent, in which our national acreage allotment should not be reduced by as much as 3 million acres.

Our national acreage allotment in 1954 was almost 4 million acres less than the 1953 acreage. In addition, my section of the country as well as other areas suffered the most disastrous drought that can be remembered. Another cut in cotton acreage for 1955 amounting to more than 3 million acres can only mean bankruptcy for some of the cotton farmers in my State and district. I am certain it would be better at this time to spread out our acreage reduction over a longer period of time rather than throw thousands of cotton farmers out of work by another drastic acreage cut this year.

I therefore urge the members of the Agricultural Committee and the Congress to give careful and early consideration to my bill and to other measures that propose an increase in the cotton-acreage allotment for 1955.

To delay consideration of such legislation could mean that any increase the Congress adopts might be too late for the planting season.

Modesto, Calif.: All-American City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in LOOK magazine on February 8, 1955, will appear an article in which the magazine and the National Municipal League, assisted by a group of distinguished civic leaders, selected 11 cities as all-American cities.

In this group is the city of Modesto, Calif. It is the county seat of Stanislaus and the second largest city within the 11th Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives.

I congratulate the mayor, Harry Marks, the city manager, and the City Council of Modesto, and Lawrence Robinson, Jr., chairman of the citizen's committee, on receiving this honor. But I must confess that I was not surprised. Many years ago when I was a municipal official in California, and a director in the League of California Cities, I organized the Central Valley division of the league. This included Modesto and from that time on I have had knowledge of the city government of Modesto. It has always been a well-governed city. Over Highway 99, the major through highway in the city, is a huge sign with this inscription: "Water, wealth, contentment, health."

Modesto is in the center of one of the richest agricultural areas in the United States. In Stanislaus County are the two most fabulous irrigation districts in California. They are the Modesto Irrigation District and the Turlock Irrigation District. They are operated jointly. Last year they had paid off their bond issues. They furnish the water to the fertile land that raises the fruits, nuts, row crops, alfalfa, and so forth, which make the county so rich and its county seat, Modesto, so prosperous.

Modesto, like most California cities, was afflicted with "growingitis." So many from outside of California came into the area that contiguous to Modesto's boundaries was a population much larger than the city's population. So the people began to agitate and later they organized to provide money, through a bond issue, to make various improvements that would attract the outside area. It did. Then came annexation to the city of many of these areas. The schools were improved to the tune of \$4.3 millions by the sale of bonds approved by the voters for necessary expansion and improved teaching techniques. Incidentally, the superintendent, James H. Corson, was an Olympic games star in Amsterdam in 1928. He

was a world champion discus thrower for a short time, being outdistanced by another American 15 minutes after he had broken the world's record.

Good municipal government in California is partly due to the nonpartisan elections which California adopted over 40 years ago. Partisan party politics are out in our city elections. The elective officers of our cities are selected by the voters who vote for those they think best able to conduct the affairs of the city government.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including a portion of the article from Look magazine about Modesto, Calif. It follows:

(By Jack Star)

Despite the traditional cynicism of politics, an American community—if it becomes indignant enough and determined enough—can stem graft, choke creeping blight, root out bumbling inefficiency, make streets safe for women and children.

As proof, the National Municipal League and Look again point to 11 communities where energetic, purposeful, and intelligent citizen action has accomplished such ends—and more. The league, which for 60 years has provided tools and inspiration for better local government, and Look have named these communities the All-American Cities of 1954.

The winners include the second largest city in the land and one of the smallest hamlets. None is necessarily a model town, but all, because of citizen action, are better places in which to live.

In the words of Dr. George H. Gallup, league president and director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, the awards are given not for good government, efficient municipal administration, or a specific improvement, as such, but rather for citizen effort.

This year, a record 225 communities were nominated for awards. The 22 finalists presented their cases before a distinguished jury of civil leaders at the annual national conference on government in Kansas City, Mo.

The winning communities are Chicago, Ill.; Decatur, Ark.; Maricopa County, Ariz.; Mexico, Mo.; Modesto, Calif.; Newark, N. J.; Pueblo, Colo.; Richfield, Minn.; Rock Island, Ill.; Rockville, Md.; and Warren, Ohio.

These are their stories:

Modesto, Calif.: Late in the 1940's, Modesto discovered that while its own population (17,000) had remained unaffected by the postwar California boom, the area outside its city limits had blossomed into an industrial section of 34,000. This huge fringe population posed a crushing problem: The suburbanites used Modesto's facilities and paid few taxes. Modesto, with no place to dump its sewage, found itself girdled by 10,000 cesspools.

The solution was annexation—make all problems common and solve them for the common good. But outside industry feared higher taxes and stricter regulation. In 1953, the voters adopted city-manager government (which had once been ruled illegal) and began wooing the suburbanites.

"Some outside industries began boycotting our merchants," recalls Mayor Harry Marks. "So we decided to make them want to come in, to offer them a city they would beg to become a part of."

A committee of 21 swelled into a committee of 1,000 and began a campaign of doorbell ringing to publicize a \$2.5 million sewer-improvement bond issue. It carried 8 to 1. An improved fire department meant lower insurance rates for industry.

The annexations began. By the end of 1954, so many areas had been annexed that Modesto's population had more than doubled

and more areas were waiting their turn. The voters approved spending \$4.3 million for schools; a youth center that stood unfinished for 3 years was completed in weeks with donated labor and materials. Many more improvements are on the way.

Commission on Organization of the Federal Judiciary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said over the past years concerning the sad conditions which exist in the Federal judiciary. Everyone agrees that something should be done and various suggestions arise from time to time, but nothing ever happens. I believe that now is the time to stop piecemeal measures and inquire into the problems of the judiciary in the broadest manner possible.

We hear about crowded calendars, insufficient number of judges, inadequate physical facilities for holding court, lack of sufficient courts, and lack of funds. These are subjects which are not charged with emotion and not too many people think about them until they themselves become litigants and victims of the inadequate system.

It is our duty as legislators to see that American citizens are not denied justice for want of an adequate, well-working court system. After all, the Bill of Rights and other constitutional guarantees mean nothing if our people do not have the instrumentalities to put them into effect.

I do not pretend to offer all the answers to the problems raised. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, I merely desire to call them to the attention of the Congress and offer a plan of attack.

I have prepared legislation and will introduce it today to establish a Commission on Organization of the Federal Judiciary. The idea is not novel and involves no departure from precedent. This plan is frankly patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission. We know of the outstanding work performed by the Hoover Commission in past years, and at the present time we are awaiting the reports of the new Hoover Commission as authorized by the 83d Congress.

The Commission contemplated by my bill would be composed of 16 members. The President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives would be authorized to appoint four members each. Half of those appointed by the President would be selected from persons in the executive branch of the Government. Half of those appointed by the

Chief Justice would be from the Federal judiciary. The two congressional leaders would make half of their appointments from Members of their respective bodies, and all other selections would be made from individuals in private life. All appointees to the Commission should be lawyers in good standing. This suggestion is made because of the technical nature of the subject and specialized knowledge required.

The Commission would be given a broad mandate to inquire into every phase of the Federal court system. A few of the subjects of inquiry might be:

First. The volume of litigation, delays incident thereto and suggested remedies.

Second. Recommendations should be made concerning the advisability of consolidating courts of special jurisdiction such as the Tax Court and others, with district courts.

Third. The necessity of realignment of judicial districts, geographical areas, and places of holding court as dictated by modern-day conditions, shifts in population, and other factors.

Fourth. The adequacy of buildings, courtrooms, libraries, and other physical facilities necessary for efficient administration of justice.

Fifth. Recommendations for liberalizing retirement laws in order to encourage retirement of judges whose efficiency is impaired due to age, infirmity, or other reasons.

Sixth. Recommendations concerning advisability of delegating jurisdiction to State courts in certain cases.

Seventh. Recommendations concerning court aids such as clerks, marshals, and others.

Eighth. Recommendations for improvement of appellate procedures.

Ninth. Other recommendations that the commission may deem appropriate.

I have not raised the question of the pay of judges inasmuch as that subject has been considered by another commission and recommendations have been made.

The proposed commission would have the usual power to appoint a staff, hold hearings, and obtain necessary data for proper discharge of its duties. It would be required to report to Congress 1 year after the commission is established.

If the Congress sees fit to authorize the establishment of a Commission on Organization of the Federal Judiciary, an opportunity will be given for the first time to the lawyers, judges, and other citizens of the United States, to submit their suggestions to one forum which is considering the individual problems and how they affect the whole judicial system. It would be expected that the bar associations and other groups concerned with the improvement of the administration of justice would take an active part in supplying necessary data, members of task forces, and rendering other valuable assistance. The advice and counsel of Members of Congress and Federal judges would also be sought. It should be kept in mind that the final duty for securing adequate justice to the American people rests with Congress. Our duties do not end with the appointment of a commission. It is incumbent

upon us to rise to the challenge and follow through with the necessary legislation once we have the recommendations. The commission would gather the facts for us on a nonpartisan basis, free from political considerations and unfettered by the myriad of details which are incidental to service in the Congress.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the traditional observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, January 22, 1918, presents an opportunity for American citizens to assure to all escapees from tyranny scattered throughout the world their sympathy, and their determination to continue the struggle for the freedom of all people.

This America believes: "That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This applies to men both behind and outside the Iron Curtain.

We hear much of peaceful coexistence today. Every one of us wants peace. To be realistic we must recognize that we do exist in a world divided into two great ideological camps. And we can hardly demand that every people and every nation adopt our form of Government or our way of life. Yet, we must strive in every legitimate way to assist those who would bring freedom to nations enslaved, or to peoples oppressed.

There are those who say that the internal rule of the Communists is none of our concern. To a displaced person this must have a strange sound. Furthermore, that attitude cannot be defended if we understand the fundamental philosophies of democracy and communism. If democracy means anything, it means a firm faith in the inherent infinite worth of the individual, in the innate dignity of the human being. If we honestly believe this, we will not be satisfied until the worth and dignity of every human being in the world is recognized, and that human being is permitted to live and act freely.

This is not to advocate preventive war nor rash and unintelligent action, but it is to warn all despots that we will continue to strive for justice and decency for all mankind.

There are good and noble people in my district who dream of the day when their captive homelands will be free again. They are working and preparing for that day. Such men were Tomáš Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia, and Syngman Rhee, of Korea. To these good people and all like them we pledge our help and our cooperation in securing a body of free nations in a free world.

Italy's Complaint on United States Subsidy of American Citrus Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, because of the administration of our laws on the high policymaking level, a conflict has developed between our foreign policy as expressed in GATT—General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs—and our statutory law as expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1935.

As a participating nation in GATT, the United States is committed to a policy of limiting subsidies where it would seriously prejudice the interests of other participating nations. Under section 32 of the Agricultural Act, however, the Secretary of Agriculture has a mandate to encourage the exportation of agricultural commodities through the use of subsidies in order to help increase America's competitive position in foreign markets. The subsidy provisions of the Agricultural Act, however—and this is an important distinction to remember—are not mandatory but permissive and give the Secretary a wide discretion in both the granting or withholding of subsidy benefits, and in the selection of the commodities to be subsidized.

The present export program of agriculture grants heavy subsidies on citrus fruits which compete directly with Italian, Israeli, North African, and Spanish citrus products in the European markets. As a result, Italian oranges, for example, are being crowded out of Italy's traditional orange markets, not because Italy's oranges are inferior, but because of United States financing of American citrus fruits. While it is presently asserted that subsidy assistance is to help American exporters to maintain their foreign markets, the fact is that the Department, through subsidies, is seeking to expand America's competitive position in foreign markets and is in fact lengthening the time period of America's so-called summer citrus market in Europe.

The United States is committed to a foreign program of helping war-ravaged and poor countries rehabilitate themselves, so that by raising their economic levels, these countries may, one day, help themselves. With the termination of direct United States economic aid, countries like Italy more than ever need their traditional foreign markets and, in fact, Italy must expand hers in order to take up the slack caused by the ending of direct United States assistance. Because it is lacking in many natural resources and cannot compete in the industrial field, Italy must rely most heavily on her agricultural export trade. The United States citrus industry, on the other hand, is enjoying an all-time high and has access to other foreign markets such as Canada without having to invade the European market on an unfair United States subsidized competitive basis, at least not at the present time.

Furthermore, if we are to follow the principle of "trade not aid" then these subsidies must be rarely if ever used. If we drive Italy and other countries similarly situated too hard and they have markets for their citrus fruits that are narrowing more and more, we force her to sell wherever she can—behind the Iron Curtain if need be.

SUGGESTED ACTION

The above statement may be an oversimplification of the problem which is indeed a complicated one with many facets. Yet, in the final analysis, it is clear that there must be greater coordination between our executive agencies, in order that conflicts, brought about by the administration of our laws, may be avoided. Negotiations under GATT have reached an impasse. The GATT agreement, unfortunately, has no true enforcement provisions, and its success depends upon the willingness and consent of the countries concerned. Since the policies set forth therein represent our latest thinking on the subject, the Department of Agriculture should revise its policy so as to eliminate those aspects which are harmful to countries like Italy, Israel, Greece, and Turkey. United States is presently subsidizing dried raisins and apricots, to the detriment of Greece and Turkey; and oranges, to the detriment of Italy, Israel, Spain, and North Africa. Without seriously prejudicing United States citrus producers, subsidy payments could be suspended on American citrus exports which are shipped to the traditional European markets of these countries, at least during their market season, which is from November through April.

Strike Averted Following Intervention of Governor Ribicoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today I am calling to the attention of the membership a significant occurrence in the State of Connecticut last week.

A statewide strike of some 2,200 employees of the Connecticut Co., the Connecticut Light & Power Co., which would have paralyzed a large portion of the transportation system of Connecticut, was called off after Gov. Abraham Ribicoff intervened and succeeded in bringing both sides together.

Many of my colleagues will remember Governor Ribicoff as my distinguished predecessor, the Representative from the First Congressional District of Connecticut.

Governor Ribicoff believes that the welfare and prosperity of this country to a very large extent depends upon a harmonious and cooperative effort between employees and employer. Several times in the course of his public career he has publicly voiced this philosophy.

In the bus strike he applied this philosophy with great effectiveness. As a result of his efforts, this strike which would have been disastrous in many respects, was completely avoided.

For his successful efforts, the bus drivers' union and officials of the Connecticut Co. have both expressed their thanks to the Governor. The people of Connecticut join in this expression of gratitude.

I have taken this time to bring this matter to the attention of the House, not only to pay tribute to a great Governor who was a former Member of this body, but as well to point out that this is the kind of leadership in Government which will produce a more stable society in the United States of America.

The Memory of Agnes G. Shankle: Fighter for Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following in memory of the late Agnes G. Shankle.

The older people of the United States have lost one of their very best friends, in the passing of Agnes G. Shankle, who was secretary-treasurer of the National Pension Federation, Inc., Washington, D. C., and editor of the National Pension Guide.

Adequate universal pension coverage for all our senior citizens 65 years of age and older without any ifs, buts, or ands, this was the goal to which she devoted herself unsparingly.

Not for personal gain or glory, but out of the fullness of her heart, finding fulfillment in helping others.

Before congressional committees she argued cogently and convincingly on the need of a national pension, and she provided inspiring leadership for the millions of aged to whom she was the symbol of hope.

The facts and figures she presented to prove that a national pension is not only necessary but inevitable were illuminated by her own earnestness and sincerity.

Into the arena of economics and politics, she brought the saving grace of humanity and the spirit that is eternal.

When the day surely comes that her vision becomes reality, every older person in this Nation can thank the pioneering efforts of Mrs. Shankle for the security they will enjoy during the closing years of their lives.

Our grief is comforted by the knowledge that she is safely home in the kingdom of the blessed.

As she would wish, we shall continue the good work to which she dedicated her life until a national pension becomes a beneficent law of this land and a living memorial to Agnes G. Shankle.

Anniversary of the Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 37th anniversary of the Ukrainian people. This anniversary symbolizes the love for freedom by all the peoples enslaved by Communist domination. Their indefatigable spirit of opposition to Communist oppression commands the admiration and the support of the entire American people. When their unity of purpose and resistance forced the regimes in Hungary and Czechoslovakia to retreat and make concessions, what better proof could we have that the captive people entrapped behind the Iron Curtain are our staunchest allies; brothers in arms who man the outpost in the never-ceasing struggle against Communist imperialism.

Such friends will never be forgotten, for their suffering and their sacrifices serve the cause of freedom of men everywhere. Their aspirations of national independence, human rights, and dignity are the same cornerstones on which our Republic was founded and maintained. How could we fail to support, wholeheartedly, these aspirations which are the essence of democracy in which we believe, and for which thousands of Americans gave their lives on the battlefields of Europe and Asia.

The American people will not be fooled by Communist slogans of coexistence which means enslavement for millions of our brothers. We shall continue to strive for the just aspirations of the captive nations, as we have done in the past. That the Congress of the United States, and thus the people who elect their representatives, continuously study means and ways to support the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain is manifested in the work of the House Committee on Communist Aggression and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The House committee recommended to the Government a specific course of action, specifically designed to help the now captive nations attain their goal of self-determination, while the Senate's studies on tensions in Eastern Europe again demonstrated to the American people that the Communist regimes in that area only derive their power from inhuman terror and atrocities. The American people are fully aware of these conditions, and true to their tradition have formed organizations to combat them. Such private organizations as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., and the Free Europe Committee, are truly representative of the feeling of American sentiment. More important still, they prove by their action, be it by radio or leaflets dropped by balloons, that the voice of the once free nations

can never be silenced as long as the American people stand side by side with their freedom-loving brothers behind the Iron Curtain.

Anniversary of Proclamation of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Republic issued a proclamation of Ukrainian independence. Last Saturday was the anniversary of this proclamation of Independence. Since that time the Ukrainian people have suffered greatly and they are now among the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

The centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This indomitable will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan state from the 9th to the 14th century, in the Ukrainian Kozak state from 1648 to 1783, and more recently in the Ukrainian National Republic from 1917 to 1920. As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles Heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible man-made famine of 1932-33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937-39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will continues to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European iron curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

Protest Against Contemplated Merger of Chase National Bank and Bank of Manhattan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have written to the Honorable William McClesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, urging him to do all in his power to prevent the merger of the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan Co. In addition, I have asked that the Federal Reserve Board withhold its approval of any application for the establishment of branch banks which may be made as a result of this union.

In the light of the excessive accumulation of capital in the control of the parties to this merger, it is highly questionable whether the resulting banking corporation can avoid conflict with the laws and policies of our Federal Government involving monopolies and/or undue restriction of competition. Inasmuch as the merger concerns two of our largest banking institutions which are daily engaged in intensified competition with each other, there can be no doubt that the union of the two will be in defiance of and will directly flout the whole spirit and policy of our antitrust laws. I secured the passage of the Celler Anti-merger Act which prohibits the merger of corporations where such consolidations tend to substantially lessen competition in any section of the country. The merger of these two banking institutions is clearly at odds with the whole intent and policy of that law as well as with the antimonopoly policies established under the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Together, these 2 banks presently have over 80 branches concentrated in a 50-mile area in the city of New York and are daily vying with each other for the business of the people in New York. In addition, the Bank of Manhattan Co. is also set to acquire the Bronx County Trust Co. The danger is therefore evident that the merger will unduly lessen the competition which large competing banks provide and may tend to create a monopoly to the disadvantage of the people of New York and to the country generally. The businessman and merchant will find it increasingly difficult to establish credit facilities and they will be at the mercy of a financial colossus which, because of the lack of competition, will be able to set the standards providing for the bank's best interests, to the detriment of small-businessmen and other customers.

There have been 14 bank mergers in New York City in the past 7 years. Unless some brake is placed on this trend, serious consequences will befall that section of the country. If the present merger is approved, an all-powerful oligopoly, made up of the National City Bank, the

Manufacturers Trust—both the results of mergers—and the new Chase-Manhattan Bank, will have a stranglehold on New York banking facilities. Under these circumstances, the Attorney General has the clear duty, under the Sherman Act, to investigate and prevent this merger.

In addition, I have asked the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee to hold hearings on my present bill, H. R. 2115, which is a measure designed to subject all bank mergers and consolidations to the scrutiny and written approval of Federal banking authorities. The bill, in substance, would require that before any bank merger can be effectuated, the approving Federal official would determine whether or not the merger or consolidation would lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly contrary to the policy of Congress hereby declared in favor of local ownership and control of banks and competition in the field of banking.

I advise Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve System, Attorney General Brownell, and Governor Harriman, Superintendent of Banks in New York State, and the Comptroller of Currency, that, in the event this merger goes through, it is my intention to have a full and complete investigation by the House Judiciary Committee of which I am chairman.

Also, because of the unwarranted rise in the stocks of these banks, there are strong indications of stock jobbing and sale manipulations. The records of brokers, traders, directors and officers of the banks in question should be closely scrutinized by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I have in addition, introduced a bill designed to subject all bank mergers and consolidations to the scrutiny of Federal banking officials. The bill, in substance, would require that before any bank merger could be effectuated, it would be necessary to obtain the written consent of appropriate Federal banking authorities as follows:

First. If acquiring bank is insured national or District of Columbia bank, approving agency is Comptroller of the Currency.

Second. If acquiring bank is insured State member bank, approving agency is Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Third. If acquiring bank is insured nonmember bank, approving agency is Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.

Fourth. If acquiring bank is noninsured bank, approving agency is Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

In determining whether or not to approve the merger, officials, under the terms of the bill, would be required to determine if the effect of the merger or consolidation "may be to lessen competition unduly or * * * tend unduly to create a monopoly contrary to the policy of Congress hereby declared in favor of local ownership and control of banks and competition in the field of banking."

The bill would enlarge upon existing statutory provisions in several important respects. As provided by the Federal

Deposit Insurance Act of 1950, Federal banking officials must approve mergers between insured banks only where the capital stock or surplus of the resulting bank will be less than the aggregate capital stock or surplus of the two institutions combined. Under existing law, the Comptroller of the Currency also must grant his approval before the merger of two national banks or a national bank and a State bank can occur; and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation must lend its sanction to mergers between insured and noninsured banks. In none of these instances, however, is the competitive impact of the merger a necessary element to be considered in granting or withholding approval of Federal officials.

The bill I have introduced would extend the merger provisions of existing statutes to include all insured banks regardless of the capitalization of the financial institution resulting from the merger and to require approval of mergers and consolidations of all noninsured banks as well. It would also make it necessary for Federal officials, in adjudging the merits of proposed mergers, to inquire as to the effect of the consolidation upon competition and monopoly power in the field of banking.

In introducing the proposed legislation, I wish to emphasize that no impartial observer viewing the financial structure of the Nation can feel other than alarm over the constant and unremitting decline in the number of banks serving depositors and borrowers in the country. This is a trend which began well before the great depression and has continued even into the most prosperous periods of our history. In 1951, more than 80 banks were lost through consolidation or absorption into other institutions. In the first half of 1952 alone, 52 banks went by way of merger.

Many of these consolidations result principally in strengthening the already powerful position of large banking institutions. Manufacturers Trust Co., for example, has risen to the position of the fifth largest bank in the United States principally by virtue of the efforts of the many fine banking institutions which it has absorbed, such as Brooklyn Trust Co., Equitable Trust Co., of New York, Flatbush National Bank, of Brooklyn, and others. Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., 11th ranking bank in the United States, has in recent years embarked upon a program which has resulted in the acquisition of many small suburban banks in the residential communities surrounding Pittsburgh. We see in the Bankers Trust Co., as another example, this surge toward financial concentration. Bankers Trust Co., since 1950, has absorbed such independent banking institutions as Title Guarantee & Trust Co., Lawyers Trust Co., Flushing National Bank, Commercial National Bank & Trust Co., and the Bayside National Bank, of New York. At the present moment there is a contemplated merger between the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan Co.

Something must be done to put a halt to this continued decrease in our bank population. Access to capital for all

types of businesses, small as well as large, must be safeguarded. Concentration of financial power in a comparatively small number of banks must be discouraged. These are not partisan objectives—on the contrary, they are the aims of all those interested in preserving free and independent enterprise.

Present laws relating to bank mergers are completely inadequate. This is confirmed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, whose Chairman wrote me some time ago, as follows:

It is apparent, therefore, that present statutory provisions with respect to bank mergers and consolidations do not provide effective means for the prevention of mergers and consolidations which may result in a lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. Even in those cases in which consent is necessary, the law does not specifically require the Comptroller of the Currency, the FDIC, or the Board, in determining whether to grant or withhold consent, to consider whether the proposed merger or consolidation will lessen competition or tend to a monopoly or to consider any other specific standards or guides.

The objective of this bill is consonant with that of the Congress in recently enacting the Celler Antimerger Act amending section 7 of the Clayton Act extending the merger provisions of that statute to acquisition of corporate assets as well as stock by those concerns subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission. It is now time to close another loophole in our salutary laws against mergers, and I believe this is the kind of legislation to which Members of both parties can freely lend their support.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Ukrainian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in rendering tribute to the 37th anniversary of the founding of the free and independent Ukrainian Republic, which was celebrated on January 22, 1955. Thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent on that day reaffirmed their active faith in the eventual liberation of all the enslaved nations in the Communist empire.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. We should not ignore its historic claim to national freedom and independence. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the building of a free Europe of tomorrow must be assured if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be unquarrelable.

For two or more nations to coexist there must be a common ground of un-

derstanding, based on responsibility, confidence, and respect. Above all, there must be a respect for each other's sovereignty. When sovereignty is respected responsibility and confidence will follow. A Communist dictatorship to hold its people must create havoc between themselves and other nations, such as cold wars, little hot wars and big wars, blaming and pointing to the rest of the world as warmongers and aggressors against them. Ukrainian principles are an abomination to Communists, who would destroy every principle of life that is religious and good, since it is their aim to bend everyone to the atheistic precepts of Marxism.

Americanism Activities of Kings County (N. Y.) Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this country can be proud of the services rendered by the people of the Jewish faith since the time of the Revolutionary War. The Jewish people have actively participated, with glory and distinction, in all the wars in which our great country was engaged.

In 1896, men of the Jewish faith organized the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. During the many years of its existence, this organization has been concerned with a twofold purpose: protection of the war veteran and his rights under the law, and a program of Americanism.

The Kings County—Brooklyn—Jewish War Veterans deserve recognition for the outstanding work which they have accomplished in both of these fields, with particular emphasis on their Americanism program. It is readily understandable that men, who have offered their lives in the service of their country during wartime, should logically be concerned with the welfare of our Nation in peacetime. It was in the fulfillment of this program that the Kings County Council of Jewish War Veterans instituted a program several years ago to help awaken the people of this country to the menace of communism.

By way of constructive action, a boycott was instituted at the time to inform the community of the goods produced by Russia and its satellites. Posters were printed and distributed in all stores listing these countries and the goods which originated from there. All large department stores were contacted and advised of this program. Cooperation was obtained from them and a campaign of public relations was undertaken to advise the public not to purchase goods made behind the Iron Curtain.

Side by side with the menace of communism exists also the menace of fascism, and there, too, the Jewish War Veterans of Brooklyn have been diligent and

alert. Since the fall of nazism in Germany, the Jewish veterans' organization of Kings County has been alert to any incidents which might arise in our country in an effort to prevent a resurgence of these un-American activities.

While in past years there have been isolated instances of such activities, it was not until 1950 that a concentrated effort appeared on the New York scene. A group of individuals formed an organization called the National Renaissance Party. At that time, Ted Brooks, the JWV Kings County commander, appointed Jerry Cohen to head a committee to investigate and assemble facts about the National Renaissance Party. The committee included several officers of the veterans' organization: Emanuel Greenberg, Benjamin H. Chasin, Lester Sacks, Marshall G. Kaplan, and the executive director of veterans' group, Henry R. Shields.

Under the leadership of Jerry Cohen, secretary to Municipal Court Justice Harold J. McLaughlin, of Brooklyn, the committee was assigned specific duties in Yorkville, a section of the borough of Manhattan, where the followers of this party were concentrated.

The National Renaissance Party was headed by a young fanatic, James H. Madole, who with 20 or 30 followers began to sing the praises of Hitler in vituperation against the Jewish people at a series of street-corner meetings on 88th Street in Yorkville. These men appeared wearing the uniform similar to the Nazi bund, with brassards on which was a lightning-bolt insignia replacing the swastika. Their program and propaganda was practically a word-for-word "steal" from the Nazi dictators. For example, their program advocated the establishment of a Fascist corporate economy, the preservation of the white Aryan race by gradual deportation of Puerto Ricans, Negroes, and Jews, and the denial of citizenship, and professional and political posts to Jewish people.

In addition to Madole, John M. Lundoff, Kurt Mertig, Hans Schmidt, James R. White, and Keith H. Thompson, Jr., continued to disseminate this type of vicious propaganda at street-corner meetings and to extoll the virtues of Hitler through publications.

It was disturbing to find that in a city like New York, comprised of over 8 million people of heterogeneous groups, who had been living side by side in harmony and peace and in understanding and respect for each other's religious beliefs and feelings, people should now be subjected to an indoctrination of the principles of nazism. This was an insult to every decent American. It was also a challenge.

The Kings County Council Jewish War Veterans was among the first to accept this challenge. Here was an organization which recognized this menace. For it was only a short time ago, in 1933, when Hitler came into power in Germany, that the Jewish War Veterans of Kings County had helped to awaken our great country and had initiated an economic boycott against Germany. Now, more than 20 years later, we find the

same evil seeking to gain a foothold in America. It had to be stopped in time, and the Kings County Jewish War Veterans accepted the challenge.

Night after night the members of the JWV committee spent in Yorkville in an effort to obtain the necessary information to prove that the leaders and the followers of the National Renaissance Party were un-American and against our way of democratic life. They visited stores, meeting halls and places of public assembly, where little groups had gathered to discuss this new party. They attended their secret meetings, knowing all the time that if they were discovered they were subjecting themselves to either a beating or perhaps their very lives would be endangered.

When information was received that the National Renaissance Party had a definite schedule of outdoor meetings, the Kings County Jewish War Veterans, in order to counteract the venom and hate which was disseminated at these meetings, obtained permission to hold Americanism rallies on the opposite street corner at the same time. The Jewish War Veterans rallies were orderly and well conducted; their purpose was not only to tell the true story of the American people, but to enlighten the people of Yorkville about the threat represented by the National Renaissance Party if it is permitted to grow and gain a foothold in America.

At one time, it was necessary to call upon the Jewish War Veterans from Brooklyn and from the entire city of New York to come to Yorkville to counteract a very large rally that the National Renaissance Party had planned. In addition, the leadership of the American Legion and the Catholic War Veterans were notified of this activity and they, too, joined with the Jewish War Veterans.

The press of New York was solicited for its help. Radio Commentator Barry Gray is to be commended for the efforts which he exerted through the media at his disposal, informing the public of what was taking place under their noses. Feature stories and articles were also published in the New York press.

It is interesting to note that the very same people whom James Madole hoped to influence by appealing to their "nationalism" were the ones who repudiated him, heckled him, and told him, in no uncertain terms, that they want no part of him and his followers.

The Kings County Jewish War Veterans, after obtaining all the facts and publications distributed by this group, forwarded them to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington. The FBI was requested to undertake an official investigation and, after the facts had been substantiated, to place the National Renaissance Party on the Attorney General's subversive list.

All of this has borne fruit. On December 14, 1954, the Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell, Jr., issued a formal call for the opening of grand-jury proceedings against the National Renaissance Party. The House Committee on Un-American Activities, likewise, is to be commended for its ef-

forts in exposing James H. Madole, the man who has labeled members of the House committee as "cowards" and has brazenly demanded that President Dwight D. Eisenhower be investigated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people owe a debt of gratitude to the Kings County Jewish War Veterans for their activities in the field of Americanism. Under the leadership of Kings County commander of the Jewish War Veterans, Milton I. Weintraub, and his Americanism committee headed by Eli Goldstein, I am certain they will continue to be alert of any group which proposes to change our way of life, be they to the far left as communism and to the far right as nazism.

ORT in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in my tour through French Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria, I made a special attempt to visit the ORT schools and facilities, and I willingly testify to the dynamic and realistic approach made by them. I know of nothing more useful in raising the standard of living of our unfortunate Jews in the Mellah than to afford the young men and women the opportunity to become skilled workers. ORT provides a great ray of hope to thousands of these people. It is really and truly the Organization for Rehabilitation and Training.

I saw ORT installations in schools in Algeria and Casablanca. I am sorry, indeed, I was not privileged to see many of the other schools which ORT has established.

I wish to draw particular attention to some 50,000 Jews, sometimes called Berber Jews, who live in the Atlas Mountains region of Morocco. They have for centuries been small craftsmen and tradesmen, who sold their wares to the Berber Moors. With the impetus of the coming of industry to Morocco, a change has occurred bringing with it new problems. Machine-made goods are replacing handmade goods and the Berber Moors are coveting the cheaper machine-made goods. This tendency is displacing some of the Jews and taking them out of the economic market. It is essential that many of these Jews be trained by ORT; for example, in the use of machines for making shoes, clothes, radios, auto supplies, and so forth.

Up until a decade ago, Jews in Morocco had a monopoly on trading in the southern part of Morocco. Now the Berber Moors are competing with them, and the Berber Moors are given the preference. The Moors only buy from the Jews when they cannot buy from the Berbers. It is to the great advantage of the Jews, therefore, to learn all they can about electronics, about the work of beauti-

clians, and other trades in which the Moors themselves are untrained. ORT can help the Jews get ready for industrial jobs through its training program.

I know of no better service to which money can be put than in contributions to the activities of ORT. The knowledge that we, the more fortunate, cannot take for granted that poverty, ignorance, and disease must always be with us—that help can and must be extended to the individual to aid him in finding a place for himself in this ever increasingly complicated society. ORT has shown the way, and to ORT every support and contribution should be given.

As I have been thinking of the development of ORT and the necessary statistics that must accompany its history, I was forcibly struck by an amazing parallel. I repeat what I said once before, that the point 4 program of the United States Government is exactly the drama of the work that ORT has been carrying on for more than 70 years. When President Truman announced the point 4 program, it was hailed—and rightfully so—as a dynamic concept of far-reaching significance in the training of the individual for the realization of a productive society. A new emphasis was placed on the individual, on his training, on his rehabilitation, teaching the use of tools first for his own benefit and for the benefit of the society in which he lives. It was a departure from mass thinking. It focussed attention on the needs of the individual, on the dignity of the individual, and how he as an individual contributes to the common good. It struck me then how ORT quietly, persistently, and even doggedly had inaugurated just such a program many years ago.

In 23 countries of the world ORT is training people in new uses of the hands and the eyes and the mind, lifting from them the weight of their uselessness and with such training bringing an understanding of new standards, of pride which will some day reflect itself in their children yet to be born.

A fact to be noted and remarked is the realization that ORT follows the line of history. The camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy are now closed. Most of the DP's are gone. ORT has turned its gaze eastward and to Africa, as has the rest of the world. The Near, Middle, and Far East, as well as North Africa, have by the pressure of events forced the western nations, not only to acknowledge their existence, but to begin to understand for perhaps the first time that these regions of the world must relate themselves to each other. So with ORT. While retaining and maintaining its ties with the western civilization, it has brought its greatest intensity to bear upon these areas.

One cannot feel kinship with Jews in one part of the world and choose to forget about Jews in another. Sooner or later the facts will creep through to your consciousness. One cannot escape. One has to recognize the chain that links all people together regardless of geography. In Iran, in Moslem North Africa, in French Morocco, in Tunisia and Algeria, Jews have huddled in the ghettos of those forgotten worlds, feeding for

centuries only on the strength of Judaism. They are no longer forgotten. ORT will not let us forget. ORT is bringing new values to live by, a new dimension to life itself, to these people whom civilization has bypassed. This is not the age of despair.

In these turbulent years one fact has emerged—that it is not a natural law for some to be born and to die in helplessness, in futility and in hopelessness. I do not exaggerate when I say that in the realization of this concept, ORT has shown us how to open the doors and windows to let the sun come in, cleansing and reviving. ORT has been on that road a little before anybody else.

The Command Management School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal recently about our new military look which has been designed to give the taxpayer more defense for the dollar. Members of this body will be glad to know, I am sure, that our Army is leaving no stone unturned in its efforts to improve the efficiency of its operations and to increase the effectiveness of its combat elements.

Last week, at the invitation of my good friend, Col. John Roosma, deputy post commander, Fort Jay, N. Y., I visited a most unique and progressive establishment in the Army at nearby Fort Belvoir, Va. The Army calls it the command management school. What I saw was a gigantic step forward in the improvement of military management.

As we all know so well, two-thirds of our mammoth budget is spent for national defense. It is our duty to see that these funds are spent wisely and well. I am convinced that this school will do more to accomplish this end than anything I have yet seen, and I think I might say that I am not without some military experience.

We know that the military has installed, in recent years, many new tools and systems in the management of their installations all over the world. Most of these have been borrowed from our industrial enterprises, which are justly world famous for their managerial efficiency. The Army has recognized, however, that a tool in any system is no better than the executives who administer it. In the command management school the Army has accordingly set out to educate its key officers, largely the installation commanders, in how to use these tools and how to apply them to the business of managing an installation.

The Harvard Business School's advanced management program has been well known for years in the industrial world for its ability to train mature, experienced, business executives and to improve their management skills. The Army's command management school

has been amazingly successful in adopting the methods applied by this and similar institutions and in converting these methods to their own use in the training of post commanders and principal staff officers.

Under the direction of the Army Comptroller, Lt. Gen. G. B. Decker, and his chief management assistant, Maj. Gen. L. R. Dewey, the school assembles 50 senior Army installation commanders, staff officers, and key civilian employees, each 4 weeks and puts them through an intensive, round-the-clock course in the efficient management of men, money, and materials. A hand-picked and well-trained faculty of senior Army officers is headed by Col. Frank Kowalski, of Meriden, Conn., the school's commandant. He is ably assisted by a civilian management engineer, Mr. Gilbert C. Jacobus, of my own State of New Jersey. The permanent teaching staff is liberally supplemented by outstanding speakers in the management field from industry, from Government, and from the educational world as well as from the military.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that these men, the generals and colonels who command the Army's installations, are the individuals who, in the final analysis, manage the Nation's resources which have been entrusted to them by Congress for our defense. Having seen these officers attacking the Army's management problems at the command management school, I know that each one will do his job in a far better and more efficient manner as a result of this training.

The school is indeed a new approach to military education. All of our armed services have been justly praised by every professional educator who has examined their systems of schools, but these, until now, have been limited to the purely military fields of tactics, strategy, and logistics. The Army has now recognized the need for the schooling of its senior officers in the field of nontactical commands, of the management of resources: Men, money, and materials.

This school for managers is more than just a classroom. It is in effect, a meeting-place, where the officers participating live; they eat, sleep, and breathe management on a 24-hour basis. Needless to say, the assembly of 50 officers, each with 20 or so years of service, represents a vast quantity of experience; experience that can be utilized by colleagues and is shared among all. The commandant told me that this is really the secret of the success of the school. The discussion of down-to-earth, concrete problems and the exchange of ideas on how best to solve them, not only in the classroom, but anywhere and everywhere, goes on literally around the clock. Throughout these discussions the school constantly emphasizes the need for accomplishing assigned missions effectively with fewer dollars. The payoff here is dollars saved. One of the students, a brigadier general who commands a large military post here in the East, told me that he dreams management nearly every night. I might add that he, like all of the other students, is delighted with the course and feels that

he really is learning how to improve his post. This is the real proof of the pudding, and I am convinced that the school will stand the test of time.

In my enthusiasm for the school I do not want to give the Members of this body the impression that the Army has become so management minded that it has forgotten the primary reason for its existence. So I hasten to assure you that the school, the faculty, and the officers who attend the course are all keenly aware that the Army exists to accomplish the mission assigned to it, to protect the security of our people around the world. On the other hand, every dollar saved, every wasteful practice eliminated, means just that much more effort can be channeled to increase the combat effectiveness of our Army. This is the purpose of command management, and this is the purpose of the school that I visited.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this body would be impressed, as I was impressed, with this example of progress and forward thinking by our Army. I strongly recommend that as many as possible visit Fort Belvoir and see the school in operation for themselves. On every battlefield since the days of Valley Forge, our Army has shown its ability to win wars; it is now showing its efficiency in helping to win the peace which, God willing, we can and will attain.

Thirty-fifth Anniversary of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of the House the 35th anniversary of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce observed January 21, 1955.

I have had a personal interest in the work of this fine organization for almost a decade, having been an active member, committee chairman, and member of the board of directors of the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The Jaycees have grown to where they now command the well-established position of one of America's most dynamic groups. I understand that nationally there are over 2,750 local chapters and 200,000 individual members. In addition, the junior chamber is worldwide in scope; it exists in 58 countries and has a foreign membership of over 100,000 young men practicing the same democratic principles that we practice here.

I am particularly proud of the fine work our California Junior Chamber has done. Their slogan, "California Jaycees Get the Job Done," indicates the attitude with which this organization operates. In addition to participation in civic improvement and public affairs, the California organization encourages

and emphasizes youth development and leadership training in young men.

I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for its work in the past and best wishes for continued success in the future.

Events in Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 of this year I sent a telegram to our able Secretary of State, Hon. John Foster Dulles, urging immediate and vigorous action by the United States under Mr. Dulles' personal direction and within the framework of the Organization of American States to bring about a cessation of hostilities and of needless bloodshed in Costa Rica. I am pleased to report that the Organization of American States has moved swiftly and it now would appear that a serious menace to the Panama Canal and to the entire Western Hemisphere has been averted. All of us can be proud of the Organization of American States and of the vigorous leadership taken by the United States within that organization's framework.

As the membership of the House well knows, the headquarters of the Organization is in Washington, located several blocks from the White House and the Department of State. I urge as many Members of this House as possible to become better acquainted with the Organization of American States by observing at first hand the many useful activities pursued at its headquarters.

There follows the text of an address delivered in Houston, Tex., on January 20 by the Honorable Henry F. Holland, our able, courageous, and very effective Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, covering the events which have been transpiring in Costa Rica:

During the past 10 days much of our attention has been centered on the conflict in the Central American Republic of Costa Rica. Through the newspaper, television, and radio you have followed events there. I would like to discuss with you their significance as regards the inter-American system, and the policies of our own Government.

The dimensions of the conflict itself may be small—some 10,000 Government forces, only 4,000 of them well armed, pitted against six to eight hundred revolutionaries; nevertheless, the principles and issues involved in the conflict are basic and of lasting importance to the peace and order of our hemisphere.

What has been taking place in that small Central American country is in the first place a matter of humanitarian concern to all of us because human lives and welfare are affected. If, and to the extent that, this is a domestic upheaval, it is regrettable, and would not be an occasion for United States or OAS political action. But, the

nature and apparent origin of the conflict suggest intervention from abroad and thus have presented problems of deep preoccupation to the American family of nations. At stake have been the principle of non-intervention and collective action to maintain international peace which are cornerstones of the relationship among the American States—a relationship which is unique in the divided world of today. In the balance stood the expressed intention of the American nations to come to the assistance of a sister republic when the integrity of its territory or sovereignty or political independence was threatened, thereby demonstrating the effectiveness of the inter-American regional security system. Beyond this, what is taking place in Costa Rica and the response of the Organization of American States, in my opinion, carried serious implications for the fabric of collective security which binds the nations of the free world. Happily, in this case there was no evidence that international communism had gained control of the political institutions of Costa Rica. If that had been the case, the Caracas declaration would have applied and the Communist-dominated government would have been deemed a common danger to all of the American Republics.

I am pleased to say that the challenge has been met by the OAS, and in a rapid, effective, and resourceful manner.

Before taking up the course of events in the Costa Rican crisis and their significance, I believe I should very briefly describe the inter-American machinery to which that country appealed for any of you who might not be familiar with it. The Organization of American States, or OAS as we generally refer to it, is a regional organization within the United Nations. All 21 American republics are members. Its affairs are normally directed by a council comprised of representatives of each member state and which under emergency conditions such as those in the existing situation is accorded certain unusual and extensive powers such as those it has exercised during recent days.

Among the organization's basic purposes as expressed in its charter are the following:

1. "To strengthen the peace and security of the continent."
2. "To prevent possible causes of difficulties and to insure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member states."
3. "To provide for common action on the part of those states in the event of aggression."

A fundamental principle vouchsafed in the charter is that:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an armed attack or by an act of aggression that is not an armed attack, or by an extra-continental conflict, or by a conflict between two or more American states, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the American states, in furtherance of the principles of continental solidarity or collective self-defense, shall apply the measures and procedures established in the special treaties on the subject" (art. 25).

The principal treaty referred to in this article is the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, known as the Rio Treaty. It is under this treaty that Costa Rica on January 8 appealed to the Council of the Organization for assistance, considering itself to be in imminent danger of invasion.

The Costa Rican call for OAS action brought to a head issues and difficulties which have hovered in the background for some time. Last spring, after frustration of an attempt to assassinate him, the President of Nicaragua asserted that the President of Costa Rica, from whose territory certain of the conspirators had come, was implicated.

Thereafter the Costa Rican Government from time to time asserted that a revolutionary movement was being prepared against it from outside its territory, with the toleration, if not assistance, of other governments.

During this period of tension in the area those of us dealing principally with Latin American affairs in Washington were informed of these developments. Not infrequently we were called upon to lend our assistance in an effort to ease the difficulties. At times, both before and after the recent outbreak, we have been asked to provide more direct assistance ourselves.

In response to such appeals, the policy of the Government of the United States has been to take such informal and friendly steps as we believed would be proper and helpful to bring about a more cordial atmosphere between the governments concerned. We also encouraged them to make every effort to resolve their difficulties by direct negotiations. All members of the Organization of American States clearly have a responsibility to strive for such settlement under the charter of that body, the Rio Treaty, and the U. N. Charter. However, we have firmly and consistently insisted that governments which found themselves unable to resolve their difficulties by direct negotiations should utilize the abundant and effective machinery of the Organization of American States in achieving that peaceful solution which is enjoined upon all members of the inter-American community. Specifically, we have repeatedly advised that a government which had reason to believe that its sovereignty or political independence were endangered from outside its territory should place its complaint before the Organization of American States. We believe that procedures which are readily available in the OAS can be effective, and that the degree to which they achieve good results depends in no small measure upon the degree to which the American States resort to them, and thus demonstrate their confidence in them. No machinery for the maintenance of peace and security can demonstrate its effectiveness unless it is used by the governments that created it.

Now let me review briefly the order of events in connection with Costa Rica's appeal to the OAS. That will permit a clear understanding of the role played by the United States and the other members of the OAS.

On Saturday, January 8, the Costa Rican representative notified the Council of the Organization of American States that his government believed an invasion of its territory was imminent and that the movement was being supported in violation of the obligations of the governments under inter-American treaties. These prohibit any American state from resorting to force in a dispute with another and require each state to take effective measures to prevent its territory from being used to further an armed attack on any other state. Costa Rica asked that the provisions of the Rio Treaty applicable to such emergencies be invoked.

The Chairman of the Council immediately called a meeting of that body for the following day. Subsequently, the meeting was postponed 24 hours, with the concurrence of the representative of Costa Rica, because of the absence of the Nicaraguan representative from Washington.

The Council met on the afternoon of Monday, January 10, and heard Costa Rica present its case and Nicaragua's denial of the allegations of its complicity in any revolutionary movement. No act of violence having taken place, and considering it desirable for the representatives to consult their governments on the matter, the Council scheduled a further meeting for Wednesday, calling upon the Governments of Costa Rica and Nicaragua to take the necessary measures

to prevent any acts which might aggravate the situation.

The situation changed drastically the following morning, Tuesday, January 11. Rebel forces attacked and occupied the Costa Rican town of Villa Quesada, some 60 miles within Costa Rica, north of its capital, San José. At the request of Costa Rica, the Council of the OAS met immediately that day. In view of the new circumstances, it did not hesitate to apply the Rio Treaty, and as a first step to send an Investigating Committee without delay to the scene to ascertain the facts. The United States was privileged to be designated as a member of the Committee, together with Mexico, Brazil, Paraguay, and Ecuador. The Committee was named at 9 o'clock in the evening. At 6 the following morning the group was on its way in a plane which, in view of the urgency of the matter, was furnished by the United States. The Council had acted with vigor and dispatch.

While the Investigating Committee was en route on Wednesday, a new element entered the picture: Costa Rica reported that during the day several towns, including the capital, had been bombed and strafed by aircraft coming from the north. Costa Rica pointed out that, having no air force of its own, this development posed a new and serious danger to its security. Not only was the danger increased, but it appeared that such elements could only have come from outside Costa Rica.

In response the Council called urgently upon all American governments to take the measures necessary to prevent the use of their territories for any military action against another government. But it also made what I think is an historic decision in the inter-American system; the establishment for the first time of an international aerial patrol under the supervision of an OAS body for the purpose of making peaceful observations over the region affected by the situation. To accomplish this, the member governments in a position to do so were requested to place at the disposal of the Investigating Committee aircraft which would fly in its name and under its supervision. Within 2 hours after this decision was unanimously taken by the Council, our Government announced that it was making planes available. Ecuador, Uruguay, and Mexico have taken the same step.

The use of peaceful observation flights under the supervision of the Investigating Committee is a new development in inter-American peace machinery. Multiplying the eyes and expanding the vision of the five-man committee, this procedure doubtless also served as a deterrent to any international transit of men and arms in violation of treaty obligations.

Recognizing the need for a finding of facts, the Council requested the Investigating Committee to send immediately a preliminary report on the situation. This is the Committee did with noteworthy speed.

This report received late Thursday indicated that aircraft originating from outside Costa Rica had machine gunned and bombed several places in the country, and that there existed grave presumption that arms entering Costa Rica were continuing to arrive across its northern frontier. On Friday the Council, on the basis of this information, condemned the acts of intervention against Costa Rica; it called on all American governments, especially Nicaragua to the north, to redouble their efforts to prevent their territories from being used for military action. It also directed its Investigating Committee immediately to send observers to all airports and other places in the region which might be used to transport military elements into Costa Rica. Meanwhile, constant aerial surveillance under the supervision of the Investigating Committee continued, as did the other activities of the Committee.

At midnight on Saturday, January 15, the Committee reported that its reconnaissance indicated that the air force of the revolutionary group operating in Costa Rica had been increased by the addition of one P-47 which had come from outside Costa Rica. This plane had been used in strafing operations. The Costa Rican Government had no combat aircraft with which to meet this new threat.

At 2 o'clock in the morning on Sunday the Council of the OAS met to consider what should be done in the light of this latest development. The Council was informed that Costa Rica had asked that the United States sell it four P-51's. Since the problem was being dealt with by the OAS, we would not send such war material into the area except at the request of the Council. We told the delegates that we could, under our laws, make a sale of the four planes to Costa Rica, and that, if the Council requested that such aircraft be made available to the Costa Rican Government, we would do so. Five hours later, at 7 in the morning last Sunday, the Council unanimously approved a resolution which made known its desire that these aircraft be sold to Costa Rica. At 3 that afternoon the 4 P-51's were on their way to Costa Rica. They arrived on Monday, January 17, and have been turned over to the Costa Rican Government.

There has been speculation in the press as to the price of the planes which have been transferred to Costa Rica. United States law requires that the price of military equipment sold to other friendly governments be fixed at its fair value, which is determined according to standards specified in the Mutual Security Act of 1954. In past sales of similar equipment that price has been far less than the original cost of the planes. The price in this case is now being determined by the Department of Defense and will be fixed on the basis of the type of plane and equipment, spare parts and services made available with them. I might add that if because of price or any other reason Costa Rica would now prefer not to have the planes, we would be satisfied to have them returned. They were withdrawn from National Guard units here in Texas, where they are useful.

After its night session the Council reconvened at 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon to consider what further measures might be taken to insure against treaty violations. It had before it petitions from both Costa Rica and Nicaragua that effective surveillance of their frontier be established under the OAS for the purpose of keeping watch on border crossings by revolutionary forces or supplies. The Council approved this request, directing its investigating committee to plan and maintain effective vigilance of the border through its military advisers.

Aerial reconnaissance revealed that the rebel forces had 4 planes—2 AT-6 trainers, a DC-3 cargo plane, and the F-47, which I have mentioned. The DC-3 crashed last Sunday. On Monday the air patrol reported that the three remaining planes had left the rebel airstrip in Costa Rica. Later the two trainers were observed to land in Rivas, Nicaragua, where the pilots surrendered to Nicaraguan authorities who report that the Government has interned the aircraft and crews. The whereabouts of the fighter plane has not been determined.

This account of the action taken by the OAS speaks well of the forceful and expeditious manner in which the 21 American republics, operating through their regional organization have been able to act. Not only has its action saved lives and property which would undoubtedly have been destroyed had the fighting become more widespread, it has also shown to the world that effective machinery exists and is being used in this hemisphere for the prevention of international conflicts. This success will strengthen

the Organization of American States by giving a concrete demonstration of its power as a deterrent to warfare in this hemisphere. The United States as a member of the OAS may be justly proud of its contribution to this joint undertaking.

A question often asked me in the last several days is, "Who is responsible for this armed conflict in Costa Rica? Are the accusations made by the Governments of Costa Rica and Nicaragua against each other true?" This is not a question for any one member of the American community to decide, and we shall not engage in speculation. The determination of facts and the assessing of guilt, if any, is the function of the OAS. If we want to preserve the dignity and integrity of our regional organization we must not prejudice issues which it is studying preparatory to rendering a decision upon them. Nor must we expect hasty decisions from it. The Investigating Committee is still in the field. It has just spent time in Nicaragua where at the invitation of that Government it has been assembling information. Until all of the facts are in, it would not be proper to render any judgment, as the voicing of unfounded or unsupported accusations by an official spokesman of any of the American governments would only tend to worsen the situation.

The importance of the OAS action thus far lies chiefly in the prompt and resourceful way in which it acted to protect the sovereignty, integrity, and inviolability of the territory of one of the member states. Despite the small size of the military engagement which is involved, the issues presented were the kind that could in the future arise in connection with any member of the group. The measures applied were unique. Never before has the Organization requested the establishment of pacific observation flights or requested the sale of military equipment to a beleaguered member. Under these circumstances one cannot exaggerate the significance of the fact that all decisions not only of the Council but of the Investigating Committee have been taken unanimously. Americans throughout our 21 republics can be grateful that the peaceful solution of our problems has been entrusted to this regional organization to which the Soviet veto cannot extend.

The OAS has acted with speed and efficiency which deserves the applause of all the members of the inter-American system. In less than 4 days actions were taken which put an investigating group into the affected area and gave it the means for carrying out peaceful observations of the widest possible scope. I doubt that in any similar situation an international investigating body has discharged its duties with greater diligence, greater speed, or greater resourcefulness.

Furthermore, as a result of the OAS action, aircraft were made available which enable Costa Rica to defend itself against marauding planes introduced from outside its territory. The basis has been established for a system of effective frontier vigilance. These are remarkable achievements for any international organization.

Let me summarize the policy which the United States Government has pursued and will continue to pursue in this matter. First, we support vigorously all appropriate steps determined by the Organization of American States to protect the obligations and guarantees of the treaties upon which our inter-American system is founded, and we make every effort to insure that these steps are taken on the basis of facts rather than charges or rumors. Finally, we are committed to a policy of strengthening the OAS as an effective international organization within the United Nations to which members of the American family should in the first instance refer such problems as this for peaceful solution.

Restoration of the Rights and Liberties of the Ukrainian People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Communist Russia has enslaved the people of the Ukraine, and they no longer have the liberties which they formerly enjoyed, nor do they have an opportunity to better themselves.

I know many people who came from the Ukraine, and they make good citizens, and are entitled to recognition in the Republic of the United States of America.

The restoration of the rights and liberties of the Ukrainian people is one of the things that should be sought after by the free world just as soon as the opportunity presents itself.

Administration Should Fill Judgeship Vacancies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, efforts have been made to ask the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States to address a joint session of Congress, in order that the problems of the Court, with particular reference to its clogged calendars, be made known. In that connection, permit me to submit a list of vacancies in judgeships in the Federal court, other than the Supreme Courts, which includes the time the vacancies have existed, as of January 11, 1955:

Location	Origin of vacancy	Date vacancy occurred
Circuit judgeships:		
2d circuit.....	Retirement of Judge Chase.....	Sept. 1, 1954
5th circuit.....	Retirement of Judge Holmes.....	Nov. 30, 1954
Do.....	Death of Judge Strum.....	July 26, 1954
District judgeships:		
California, southern.....	Death of Judge Beaumont.....	Nov. 19, 1954
Do.....	New position.....	Feb. 10, 1954
Delaware.....	Do.....	Do. ¹
New Jersey.....	Do.....	Do. ¹
New York, southern.....	Retirement of Judge Conger.....	Oct. 20, 1954
North Dakota.....	Elevation of Judge Vogel.....	Aug. 20, 1954
Do.....	New position.....	Feb. 10, 1954
Oregon.....	Elevation of Judge Fee.....	Apr. 30, 1954
Pennsylvania, eastern.....	Resignation of Judge Bard.....	July 16, 1952
Do.....	New position.....	Feb. 10, 1954
Pennsylvania, western.....	Do.....	Do. ¹
Do.....	Do.....	Do. ¹
South Dakota.....	Do.....	Do. ¹
Texas, northern.....	Retirement of Judge Atwell.....	Dec. 31, 1954
Wisconsin, eastern.....	New position.....	Feb. 10, 1954
Judgeship in U. S. Customs Court:		
Customs Court.....	Retirement of Judge Cline.....	Mar. 1, 1953

¹ Date of approval of Public Law 294, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

² Nomination made Mar. 29, 1954, but not confirmed.

Is it not high time that the administration filled these judgeships, instead of shouting from the housetops that it needs no less a person than Chief Justice Warren to demonstrate the needs of the court. Let the President and the administration act, and act quickly to fill these vacancies.

GI Educational Benefits Should Be Extended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made this morning before the House Committee on Veterans Affairs in support of H. R. 587, to permit persons now in the armed services or who will be in service on January 31 of this year to continue to accrue rights of educational benefits

despite the termination of the war emergency on that date. My statement follows:

I strongly urge that this legislation be given prompt and favorable action.

President Eisenhower has given his support to this legislation. His press secretary stated on January 13, 1955:

"We would be very much in favor of it. The President believes that it would be unfair to take those rights (school accrual rights) away from men already in service. We could not include that in the Executive order (terminating the war emergency) because it required approval of Congress and legislation was necessary. We are in favor of such legislation."

I have received a number of letters from parents of young men now in service asking that justice be done in the cases of those who had voluntarily joined the armed services on the understanding that GI educational benefits would continue. It is only fair that these men who entered the service with this understanding, and whose education is being interrupted, be given a chance to complete their education when they are released from active duty.

The educational benefits program has been one of the most valuable and successful projects for veterans. To cut off their rights of accruing benefits as of January 31 would be an unfair hardship; and their loss of educational opportunities would also be a loss to the public.

Its Treachery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio broadcast I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, September 18, 1954.

The address follows:

EYEWITNESS REPORTS ON COMMUNISM AND ITS TREACHERY

Communism mocks divine precepts and human virtues.

Honor, truth, justice, kindness—these have no meaning for the Reds except as bait with which to trap humanity and imprison it in slavery.

There is no wider gulf in the world than the distance and the difference between Communist promises and Communist practices.

To expose this cruel deceit, the Committee on Communist Aggression of the United States House of Representatives conducted hearings in Chicago, New York, London, Munich, and Berlin. Out of these came firsthand reports from those who had escaped the Red terror, ripping the mask from Communist propaganda, and destroying forever the illusion that the free world can coexist with this menace to all human freedoms.

I want to bring to you some of the findings of that report.

The cross section of witnesses included members of former ruling royal houses as well as ordinary workers and peasants; internationally known generals, political leaders, and soldiers; members of the formerly free parliaments and governments; clergymen of all denominations; labor leaders, seamen, and housewives, intellectuals, and even children. They were people who escaped from their Communist-controlled homelands just a few months ago, as well as those who escaped during and after World War II.

As the report says: "Barbed wires, mined fields, machineguns, savage dogs, and ruthless frontier guards, have not been able to shut the door of freedom to those who chose escape to the West."

It is proof that communism with all its power can never conquer the human yearning for freedom.

All who testified had one thing in common: they were eyewitnesses. They saw. They experienced. They were there. Most of them suffered the tortures of communism. They came separately from the different nations enslaved by communism, but with fundamentally the same story: the anti-human nature of real life under communism. The basic conclusions from their total testimony, under oath, cannot be questioned. It was a tragic parade of witnesses—people from another world, a dreadful world of mass murders and anonymous graves, of concentration camps, torture prisons, slave-labor camps, the ever-present secret police, and hatred, hatred beyond the comprehension of us Americans.

For years the world has been bombarded with propaganda that communism was both a system and a method to establish a utopia, a workers' paradise. Under it there would be no injustices and inequities which Marx had charged up against both capitalism and Christianity. Communism would establish a classless society. The state would no longer exist. So communism preached.

But how did actual conditions measure up to these rosyhued promises?

The Select Committee on Communist Aggression was authorized by Congress to investigate and find out the truth.

What they found was shocking, to say the least.

Testimony revealed that communism was able to fix its rule upon the people of captive nations only when it was supported by the Red army, preceded by subdivision which was politically, technically, and financially engineered by the Kremlin. As soon as the Communist-controlled Red army, infiltrated and dominated as it was by political commissars and elements of the NKVD, entered any area, terror, robbery, and violations of women and children became the order of the day. The people learned through bitter experience that the Communists would do whatever they wanted to do without regard for any laws, ethics, or moral codes. The people also learned that any opposition to whatever action the so-called Communist liberators took, meant certain imprisonment or death.

Then came Kremlin agents working with local traitors.

They set up governmental bodies which they tried to clothe with the appearances of legality and respectability to mislead the world and confuse local public opinion.

King Michael of Rumania testified that at the time he was the constitutional head of the country, on March 6, 1945, he stated to Mr. Vishinsky, the then Soviet foreign minister: "I am doing things in our manner and according to the interests of my country, and besides, the conference at Yalta says that every country is free to choose its own form of government."

To which Vishinsky bluntly replied: "In this case I am Yalta, and I tell you what to do."

A recent escapee from Hungary put it this way: "Before the war I had the right to vote, and elections were held in an orderly manner. Everyone could vote for the party of his choosing. After the Communists took over completely in 1948, when the elections were held, we received the ballot and couldn't even look at it. We didn't even know who the people on the ballot were. We simply placed the list in an envelope, sealed it, and dropped it in the box. At the same time the Communists transported truckloads of Communist soldiers all over the district who voted many times. That was all. It was a farce."

To destroy non-Communist political forces, the Reds resort to mass arrests and deportations. Testimony was taken by our congressional committee from many who were themselves deported. They told how men, women, and children were awakened in the darkness of night, given 1 hour to pack their modest belongings, were locked in cattle cars for transportation to Siberia. For days they had no food, water, heat, or sanitary facilities. They died like flies.

To break resistance they practice man-made famines.

In the Ukraine during 1932 and 1933, when the harvest was above average, it is estimated that from 6 to 7 million people starved to death.

Armed guards were placed around the churches and other buildings used for storing grain and the grain was allowed to spoil while people begged for something to eat. Mrs. Anna Kravchenko testified that about one-half of the people in the village where she lived died from starvation, and that special brigades of Communists were sent from Moscow to search out all food and to confiscate it.

Another witness, who requested that his true identity not be disclosed because a large number of his relatives still live in the Ukraine, gave vivid testimony of the way in which the Communists covered up the millions of deaths caused by their planned famine. He told how a famous French statesman visited the Ukraine during the time of the famine, and was taken on a conducted tour by the Communists. Every

minute of his visit, every home he saw, every person he talked to, every route he followed was carefully prearranged without his knowledge. He saw the fronts of houses newly painted, while directly in back of them people were living like animals in holes dug in the ground. He saw in the windows of the country shops along his prepared route, stocks of loaves of bread, and people who appeared to be freely buying them. What he was not allowed to see was that behind these shops and newly painted houses the police had closed off all roads to the famine-stricken population.

Other witnesses testified to instances of cannibalism, of how parents tried to save their children by turning them over to the State children's homes, how the militia would punish them if they were caught leaving their children anywhere near those homes, of how quotas were set each day for collecting corpses for burial in the fields.

We can imagine that Clement Attlee, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, and other Laborites were given the same false front tour when they recently visited Russia and China.

As to life under the Communist tyranny, Jan Jasiniski testified, and I quote: "They arrested me about 3 a. m. and took me to Kilce. When they saw that they were not getting much out of me, they began to torture and beat me. They poured salt water down my nose and pinched my fingers in a door joint. They used what looked like a twisted copper cable to beat the soles and heels of my feet, cutting the flesh so badly that I couldn't walk except on my hands and knees for 6 weeks. After 6 years in prison I escaped with a friend to the Czechoslovakia-German border. I got across, but my friend was killed."

Multiply that testimony by millions of other cases and you begin to get the picture of the cruelty and the terror that communism tries to palm off as paradise.

The committee is in possession of documentary material relating to the violent persecution of all forms of religion.

Eyewitness testimony concerning Cardinal Mindszenty's ordeal and his show trial was received by the committee. The cardinal appeared with his face gaunt and emaciated covered by a pink makeup to create an impression of health. He used Communist jargon as if it was his usual way of speaking. Saliva was trickling down his chin. He was unable to control his voice. The fraudulent nature of his trial and the false confession forced upon him by his tormenters, were exposed.

The select Committee on Communist Aggression of the United States House of Representatives, after considering a mountain of evidence detailing Communist crimes, came to the conclusion that peaceful coexistence is a Communist myth which can be attained only through the complete surrender of our free way of life for one of slavery under Moscow-controlled communism.

Knowing the fate that awaits us should we fail should make all of us more vigilant.

Peace and freedom will be in mortal danger as long as the thing called communism reaches out to enslave the world.

H. R. 587

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to H. R. 587, a bill to provide

that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, and for other purposes. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I have written to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1955.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of January 20 inviting me to testify during the hearings on your bill, H. R. 587, to permit individuals in service on or before January 31, 1955, to continue to earn educational benefits. I regret that another committee meeting precludes my testifying, and therefore I would appreciate it if you would include this letter as part of the record.

I would like to urge the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to act favorably and promptly on H. R. 587. I am convinced this bill should be enacted if we are to prevent injustice to service personnel who volunteered for terms of service of greater length than would have been required under the selective-service law in the belief that they would thereby accrue additional educational benefits. Many of them have made their plans at considerable sacrifice in order to obtain these educational benefits.

As a former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, may I commend you on your prompt introduction of this desirable legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD,
Member of Congress.

Twosome in the China Tangle?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, history might well record our times as those of twosome and the big split. We divide our world into east and west, north and south, old and new.

Will a twosome emerge in the China tangle?

Will it be east China and west China? Or will it be old China and new China, with Formosa forming the new China of the west to pace the old China of the east?

To us, there is a familiar ring in old and new, north and south, east and west. We have the Eastern Hemisphere and the Western Hemisphere, the old world and the new, North America, South America; Mexico, New Mexico; North Dakota, South Dakota; North Carolina, South Carolina; Virginia, West Virginia; England, New England; London, New London; York, New York; Jersey, New Jersey; North Pole, South Pole.

Like the winds, our names seem to blow away inherited hatreds.

One wonders whether the names east China and west China would do the same for the China tangle? Or would old

China and new China do better, with the name Formosa gone with the wind? All Chinese dislike it anyway.

They call Formosa Taiwan—Tie-Wan—gem of the Pacific.

I Believe in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension, remarks that I made on a radio program, I Believe in Massachusetts, on January 23, 1955, over station WALE, operated by the Narragansett Broadcasting Co., of Fall River, Mass.:

Thank you very much. I am glad to make my contribution to your radio audience on the subject, I Believe in Massachusetts.

If my discussion seems to reflect a Washington viewpoint, it perhaps may have value because we can evaluate the position of Massachusetts in its relationship with the other 47 States and view our position as part of the national picture.

It seems to me quite unnecessary that we should raise the question of belief in Massachusetts because all of us have a strong faith in the future of our Commonwealth and all of its people, a conviction that we need never question.

In my opinion, the future of Massachusetts is very bright. Look in every direction and you will find clear indications of a better future, which gives conviction to my belief that we are probably entering the greatest period of economic success and expansion that we have ever seen in our State. There are many signs that point in this direction.

Most of our citizens depend upon industry in our State for their livelihood. We have, I believe, been passing through a period of industrial change. Today we can now see, new signs of stabilization and growth that should be encouraging to everyone.

May I point out that change in industrial life is occurring in every State in our country, brought about chiefly by technological advances and the development of thousands of new products, that are making fundamental changes in our economy, replacing older modes of living and opening up new opportunities in increasing numbers to our citizens who are alert to these advances and will grasp the opportunities.

We should never entertain the thought that Massachusetts is declining or losing our predominant position. We are only changing and change is merely another expression of life.

We have many outstanding advantages in Massachusetts to offer the world. We have the most skilled supply of industrial labor in the United States and we have the best industrial labor record in the United States. This is recognized everywhere in the industrial world.

People in the Fall River and New Bedford as well as the Lawrence areas have witnessed the gradual loss of their textile industry. While part of this loss is represented by companies that moved away, there were a considerable number that permanently went out of business.

You also probably know that the causes for this loss in textiles were largely a worldwide over-productive capacity and a worldwide growth in substitutes for cotton and

woolen products. New uses for cotton and woolen products should be discovered. Intelligent research will enable such discoveries. The best brains of Massachusetts should be addressed to solving this problem.

May I point out to you that when an industry moves from a northern industrial center it only takes its capital, its management, and its machinery and it leaves behind its industrial plants, its highly skilled labor, the industrial facilities that they have built into the community together with many servicing organizations that do business with industry.

If utilized, these are tremendous assets of great advantage to other industrial companies. The difficulty lies in the fact that normally industry is slow in making up its mind to change and the problem is to hold all of these assets together until they can be grasped by new companies.

It is my considered opinion that the textile industry in New England is now at its lowest position and that from now on it will experience a new growth, a new life that spells opportunity for our textile industry centers that is if we have intelligent management leadership. We have the intelligent leadership in the ranks of labor.

At the same time, I am firmly convinced that new, other types of industry will quickly develop or move to these textile centers and in the end our textile communities will be healthier because of wider diversification of manufacture.

Today there are probably 150,000 business concerns in Massachusetts, of which about 12,500 are manufacturing establishments.

Back of all of these industrial concerns lays the greatest concentration of research institutions and technical engineering concerns to be found anywhere in the world. We are today recognized as the greatest center of technical education. It is inevitable that from the explorations and discoveries of these engineers and scientists will come many new products of inestimable value to Massachusetts and to the world. For example, 18 percent of all doctorates in engineering and 14 percent of all doctorates in physics in the country are awarded in educational institutions within 50 miles of Boston. Another instance is that Massachusetts Institute of Technology awards more than 25 percent of all doctorates in metallurgy in the United States.

In the fields of electrical manufacturing and plastics we are probably the fastest growing State in the country. Within the last month employment in the electrical machinery industry has become the largest employer of industrial labor in our State.

It is estimated that today Massachusetts industry is growing at the rate of one new manufacturing company or important plant expansion every working day. While most of these are small, it is from small starting and steady growth that large industries develop.

Boston is the greatest medical center in the United States. This is a well-known and self-evident fact. For illustration, the American Heart Association is allotting more funds for heart research to Massachusetts institutions than to any other State in the country.

We still lead the country in many of the major products, including shoe production which this year in Massachusetts is 9 percent higher in production than last year. It can be considerably improved upon. In spite of the concentration of certain industries, like textiles and shoes, Massachusetts is the third most diversified industrial State in the country.

We have become a great military research center. Witness the recent opening of the Consolidated Quartermaster Research Laboratory at Natick and the new and rapidly expanding Air Force Research Center at Bedford, which are encouraging and stimulating new industrial growth. I introduced the bill

which brought this great research laboratory to Massachusetts.

Occasionally we hear of an industrial company closing down or going away but we rarely ever hear of the many large companies that are either moving to Massachusetts or establishing plants here. Massachusetts is a natural for the establishing of large plants here. We have the market and we have the skilled labor.

Let me repeat the advice of our beloved late Gen. George Patton, which was "Never take counsel in your fears."

The idea that better opportunities lay in other sections of the country is either completely false or wholly temporary—so my message to the people of Massachusetts and especially our workmen is that retaining any faith in ourselves they will probably never find better opportunity than is facing us today in our grand old Commonwealth.

Gallup Poll Opinion on First-Class Postage Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under consent approved by the House, I am including herewith a statement entitled "Gallup Poll Opinion on First-Class Postage Increase."

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield has called attention to a report by George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, indicating the views of the people contacted in respect to increases in first-class mail rates.

The statement follows:

For the first time in the 6 years since an increase in postage rates was first advocated to cut down the operating deficit of the United States Post Office Department, majority opinion today favors raising the rate on first-class mail from 3 to 4 cents.

By an even greater margin, the public would approve increasing the airmail rate from 6 to 7 cents.

These facts come to light in the latest coast-to-coast survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion in which a representative cross section of the Nation's voters was asked:

"To help put the United States Post Office Department on a paying basis, would you favor or oppose increasing the rate of first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents?"

The vote nationwide and by men and women:

	National	Men	Women
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Favor.....	51	55	46
Oppose.....	45	42	49
No opinion.....	4	3	5

An increase in postal rates was first advocated in 1949 to help erase the mounting post-office deficit which since World War II has exceeded \$4 billion.

At that time an institute survey found 59 percent opposed, 33 percent in favor, while 8 percent expressed no opinion on increasing first-class postage.

The 1949 survey did find a majority would approve raising the rate on the penny post-

card to 2 cents. That increase was approved by Congress in 1952.

Each voter in today's survey also was asked:

"Would you favor or oppose raising the rate on airmail from 6 cents to 7 cents?"

The vote:

	National	Men	Women
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Favor.....	54	59	48
Oppose.....	40	35	45
No opinion.....	6	6	7

Six years ago, the vote was 51 percent in favor, 40 percent opposed, and 9 percent no opinion.

Today's survey finds that the greatest opposition to boosting first-class postal rates would come from the Nation's farmers, from southern voters and from residents of small towns and rural areas.

Rank-and-file Democrats are more opposed than are GOP voters.

In the fiscal year 1954, the Post Office had a deficit of more than \$399 million.

Last August, the President vetoed a general pay rise for the postal service's 500,000 employees, partly on the ground that the bill passed by Congress contained no provision for improving postal revenues.

U. S. S. "Forrestal"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, December 11, 1954, it was my privilege and pleasure, with thousands of my fellow Americans, to attend the launching of the U. S. S. *Forrestal* at Newport News, Va.

This will forever remain a significant date in our military history, for it signals a great milestone if not the beginning of a new era in the advance of naval and air warfare.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the complete, interesting, informing, and impressive program at the launching of our first great supercarrier, the largest and mightiest ship ever built:

PROGRAM

Air salute: Carrier group 6 from United States Naval Air Station, Oceana, Va.

National Anthem: United States Navy Band.

Introduction of William S. Blewett, Jr., president of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.

Address: William E. Blewett, Jr.

Introduction of Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.

Address: Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy.

Introduction of the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense.

Address: The Honorable Charles E. Wilson.

Introduction of the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy.

Address: The Honorable Charles S. Thomas.

Introduction of Rear Adm. Edward B. Harp, Jr., United States Navy, Chief of United States Navy Chaplains.

Invocation: Rear Adm. Edward B. Harp, Jr., United States Navy.

Introduction of sponsor: Mrs. James V. Forrestal.

Christening of the *Forrestal*: Mrs. James V. Forrestal.

Flight demonstration: Blue Angels, United States Navy Flight Team.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM E. BLEWETT, JR., PRESIDENT OF THE NEWPORT NEWS SHIPBUILDING & DRYDOCK CO., AT THE LAUNCHING OF THE U. S. S. "FORRESTAL," NEWPORT NEWS, VA., DECEMBER 11, 1954

Mrs. Forrestal, Secretary Wilson, Secretary Thomas, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. is delighted to have you with us today for the christening of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Forrestal*.

For the past 7 hours this vessel, the largest ever to be constructed, has been waterborne in the submerged shipway before us. This gigantic carrier is as trim and modern as technical know-how, looking into the future, can make her. The only conceivable bit of futurama that she lacks is to be driven by atomic power.

Her size and potency are matchless. She is a mobile base which can be located in any navigable portion of the oceans as the needs of defense or freedom of the seas may demand. From her flight deck, equipped with steam-driven catapults, she can launch the heavier planes of longer range and higher speed which are capable of delivering the latest developments in explosive power against possible enemy targets.

This mighty aircraft carrier which dwarfs any other engineering product is the greatest single instrument conceived to protect this hemisphere. Today one cannot speak in terms of countries because transportation and communication have made the world so small. While our physical world has contracted, our thinking must be expanded and translated into new and appropriate means for self-protection. The *Forrestal* is a striking example that Navy planners concern themselves with a realistic vision of the future.

The building of the *Forrestal* is a milestone for Newport News. Our workmen, many of them of a third generation, have been brought up in the creed that "we shall build good ships here * * *" and they are building into the *Forrestal* not only designed might but also their cumulative skills in shipbuilding and pride of workmanship.

The Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. is proud of its accomplishments and the privilege accorded us by the Navy in building this carrier.

Aircraft carriers have traditionally been named in honor of famous battles in our naval history or for former vessels with illustrious careers. Today, for only the second time that a capital ship has been named for an individual, this vessel will be named for the late Honorable James V. Forrestal, our first Secretary of Defense. This mighty ship will carry a mighty name which speaks to all the world of our desire for peace.

ADDRESS BY ADM. ROBERT B. CARNEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

After VJ-day, the Navy looked at the future. Some of its aspects were visible and apparent; others were obscured behind time's horizon. The informed students of the strategic meaning of the oceans were convinced of one thing: Control of those oceans must never be relinquished to an enemy.

Amid the welter of new ideas and inventions, some notion of the required tools of the future began to come into focus. One of the necessary tools of United States sea-air power continued to be the aircraft carrier. National thinking in those early post-war days was somewhat beclouded by a passionate desire to return to a peacetime economy, and this was reflected in drastic mil-

tary cuts. The aircraft carrier was a sufferer from the economic complexities of those days.

Nevertheless, the Navy went patiently ahead with its studies and evolved an aircraft carrier design which would fulfill an inevitable need in the scheme of our national security. The thinking which went into the carrier design effort kept abreast of the times with respect to development of all types of aircraft, weapons, and equipments. Difficulties were encountered throughout these development years, but the compelling logic was not to be denied; and gradually the American people came to understand the value and power of this unique weapons system. During the intervening years, the Navy had modernized some of our carriers of World War II vintage, and they are performing a worthwhile service.

This ship, from the keel up, is built for the future, dedicated to the support of our national policies and the preservation for all time of the things that we hold dear. Today, she is afloat. When she joins the fleet, she will be the mightiest warship of the oceans—versatile and durable. She, and her sisters to follow, will be our future ships of the line, and, as such, will possess an ever-expanding usefulness. They will constitute a powerful diplomatic instrument during peaceful years both by reason of their own quiet but imposing strength and also as symbols of the great national strength which alone could give them birth. They will retain their predecessors' World War II capabilities, of course, but they will also have a vastly increased firepower deliverable at greater distances, together with defenses capable of dealing with modern threats.

Offensively, this ship will be able to play her vital role by smashing at the sources of any enemy's naval power and by assisting our sister services and allied forces in carrying the fight to the foe. Wherever attack must be launched from the sea, this mighty ship and her planes will have the capability of delivering crushing blows against her assigned targets. The versatility of her aircraft and weapons will permit her to engage targets on the sea, above it, and below it, and on land where threats to our control of the sea is to be found. By her mobility, she will be able to bring firepower to parts of the world where no comparable friendly force can be found or maintained. The carrier task force takes on new and formidable significance with the advent of this new class of ship.

This carrier of the future will also have the inherent protection provided to naval vessels by the vastness of the ocean areas where their location cannot be predetermined and thus zeroed in for destruction. The aircraft carrier, by her very nature, becomes an obscure target for enemy detection and effective attack. Even if her whereabouts become known, she, with guided missile-carrying companions will offer a formidable defense against any weapons now on the drawing boards or even on the horizon. As she goes about her assault tasks, she will be protected by her own fighters, guided missiles, mighty depth bombs, and curtains of electronic energy pulsating both beneath the waves and above them to detect and herald the enemy's approach.

As awe-inspiring as are the dimensions of this leviathan, the ship, herself, is but a symbol of the vastly greater power from which she springs—the unstoppable power of a great free society, blessed with generous resources, spurred on by the incentives of freedom, ready to share with those struggling for freedom as we originally and fiercely struggled, determined not to lose any part of the heritage we have won by struggle. That is the true significance of this great ship and I give the Navy's pledge that the U. S. S. *Forrestal* will discharge her duty to her country in defense of those things for which her country stands.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES E. WILSON,
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Nearly 2½ years ago a similar group gathered here to lay the keel of the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Forrestal*. Today, as we launch this vessel, we mark another milestone in the progress we are making to modernize and improve the readiness of our armed services.

The building of this ship is a tribute to the men of the Navy who are dedicated to maintaining the freedom of the seas in the defense of our country. It is also a tribute to the skill of the loyal and capable workers of the shipbuilding industry of this country, and in particular to those of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. We are sure that they have planned well and have built well and that this ship, when commissioned, will fulfill our every expectation.

During this period of 2½ years the Navy has proceeded with the other plans and work necessary to provide the aircraft which will fly from the *Forrestal* decks and with the training of the officers and men who will man her when she joins the fleet.

The same careful planning and integration of new weapons and new technology is proceeding in all of the armed services as we continue our efforts to provide this country with the best and most modern defenses in our history. In so doing we are providing what we believe to be a real deterrent to the outbreak of another world war.

I am particularly proud that this ship bears the name of the first Secretary of Defense who did so much to build our modern Navy and whose efforts contributed so much to our national defense.

I knew Jim Forrestal well and had many contacts with him when he was Under Secretary of the Navy with Frank Knox; when he guided the Navy through the difficult war years as its Secretary; and later when he was the first Secretary of Defense. I always admired and respected him for his self-sacrificing devotion to his country.

At the keel-laying ceremony, the then Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. William C. Foster, spoke these words:

"And now let us in our hearts echo the prayer that from these beginnings an historic ship may rise successfully;

"That she will render service to the Nation consonant with that rendered by the man whose name she bears;

"And that she will carry to the far ends of the earth our championship of peace."

I would like for all of us to reiterate that prayer here today.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES S. THOMAS, SEC-
RETARY OF THE NAVY

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MOVING SEA BASE

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a historic moment for all Americans as we launch today the newest, most modern, and most powerful naval weapon in history.

It is a particularly proud moment for me personally, here in the presence of Mrs. Forrestal, Mr. Forrestal's two sons, and his brother, to pay tribute to that wonderful and dedicated American and friend whom I had the privilege of knowing and working with during World War II and who did so much to alert us to the danger of communism. His imprint is still visible and his influence is still felt throughout the Navy and in Washington.

Today you are witnessing not merely the launching of a ship, but the launching of our country's most versatile and most dispersible weapon in our nuclear arsenal.

The aircraft carrier, such as the *Forrestal*, is not only a weapon of great potency and utility today, but for the future, it is one of a family of sea weapons with even greater possibilities and potential.

For the foreseeable future, nothing is in prospect which will diminish our need for continued control of the seas—the surface

of the seas by ships, the underseas by submarines, the air over the seas by naval airpower. As a matter of fact, the advent of the atom, the jet, and the missile have increased, not decreased, the importance of sea power.

So in this atomic age, when the weapons and the nature of war are changing, the mission of our Navy has not changed. The oceans continue to be our cushions of defense, the bonds uniting us with our friends and allies, and our lifelines to overseas sources of raw materials which are so vital to our defense and peacetime production. Our continued dependence on overseas bases for many years to come, be they Navy, Army, or Air Force, will demand that we control the seas to operate and supply them.

Even more important, if war should be forced upon us, the seas are and can become increasingly vital as the mobile platforms of swift and devastating retaliation.

If we are attacked, our Nation's survival will depend on how well our system of airbases survives the initial blitz. For it is from these airbases that our counterattack will be launched. Not all of our continental airbases are certain to be invulnerable to destruction. Not all of our airbases on foreign soil are certain either to be available or usable.

Therefore the security of our airbase system is of utmost concern in our defense planning. Today, dispersal has one of our Nation's top priorities—dispersal of industry, of communications, and particularly of our retaliation system. Our airbase system must therefore not only be strongly defended, but it must be widely dispersed and as secure as possible if it is to guarantee that our retaliatory attack is launched.

Since the United States has rejected preventive war on moral grounds, our deterrent and our defense against a nuclear attack must be based on a well advertised ability and intention to counterattack with overwhelming force.

To be certain that we have the maximum defense against a surprise attack, a part of the United States counterattack has been decentralized and dispersed on unpredictable moving sea bases. These unpredictable moving sea bases complement our fixed base system and together, the two insure a balanced base system which an enemy cannot neutralize.

The *Forrestal* is one such mobile sea base—the missile carrying atomic submarine and seaplane are others. Each one of these can use the entire oceans as mobile platforms and 10,000-mile runways. The *Forrestal*'s airplanes will be able to take off and land simultaneously from her deck. This mobile base has a top speed of about 40 miles an hour; it can move rapidly to any part of the world's oceans. It is an outstanding example of dispersal. An aggressor can never be sure of its location. To find it and attack it will force him to divert a proportion of his offensive air strength which might otherwise be used to attack our homeland. The moving sea base's mobility, speed and striking power will also require that the enemy scatter, dilute and expand his defensive air power, which might otherwise be devoted to offensive roles. The *Forrestal*'s ability to haunt an enemy's shoreline carrying a lethal load is a threat he cannot ignore.

Any target can, of course, be hit under the right conditions. But a moving sea base, particularly one which can maneuver and travel at 40 miles an hour, is obviously very difficult to locate or destroy.

The *Forrestal* with its speed, its greatly reinforced armament, its improved radar vision, its heavy antiaircraft defenses, its guided missiles, and its new jet interceptor aircraft will indeed be a phantom target for any enemy.

And the modern, streamlined carrier task force surrounding the *Forrestal* will operate under a new tactical doctrine emphasizing

dispersion making it impossible to damage or destroy more than a small part, if any.

Moving sea bases, such as the *Forrestal*, also have great versatility and usefulness. They can be used in conjunction with massive retaliation. They can be used to maintain control of the seas. As we learned in Korea, they are ideal for localized wars requiring the use of conventional weapons, or in places where our fixed airbases are limited.

Because of these abilities, and particularly because of their atomic striking power, the *Forrestal* and her sister ships will be a deterrent force against aggression, and an insurance policy for peace.

The recognition of the importance of and the need for naval power is best exemplified by the Russians. The Russian Navy is the only service of any major military power that has increased in both personnel and equipment over what it was during World War II. Since that time, the Russian Navy has risen from the seventh largest navy in the world to second only to that of the United States. This growth is eloquent evidence of their fear of our transoceanic seapower, particularly of such a weapon as the *Forrestal*.

In this atomic age, if we did not have this type of mobile sea base we would be forced to invent one. Fortunately, we have it and in just a few moments you will see it launched. The *Forrestal*'s ability to carry a powerful atomic punch, its ability to take the fight right into the enemy's front yard, its ability to sustain itself at sea for long periods of time, its ability to strike a naval target a thousand miles from her deck, gives our Nation a powerful weapon for preserving a peaceful world.

Our seapower, as represented by the *Forrestal*, is therefore a great deterrent to war. We are determined to keep that seapower modern, alert, and adequate.

The launching of this great ship should elevate our confidence that peace can be achieved. We have a righteous cause, freedom and peace. We have strong friends. We have superior productive capacity. We have superior naval power to control the seas on the surface, below the surface, and in the air above.

With all of these, and above all, with God's help, we are confident of success.

INVOCATION BY REAR ADMIRAL EDWARD B. HARP,
JR., UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF UNITED
STATES NAVY CHAPLAINS

Almighty and Eternal God, who art the fountain of all wisdom and power, we come to invoke Thy blessing upon this ship. We praise Thee for this memorable and climatic moment of human achievement. We rejoice that under the dispensation of Thy providence, in this particular moment of history, Thou hast made it possible for the ingenuity, skill and labor of free men to bring this ship into being. May there come now, to those who have wrought as good workmen in its planning and construction, the inner satisfaction of having done their tasks worthily and well.

As we christen the U. S. S. *Forrestal*, we commend her to Thy guidance and care. Grant that her services may be used in the preservation of peace, and for war only when the defense of freedom and honor shall so dictate.

To this petition we add also our supplications for the President of the United States and all others in authority. We ask Thy blessing, too, upon all who serve in the Armed Forces of our Nation, particularly those who are making the greater sacrifices in the troubled areas of the world. Be pleased to protect and uphold them with Thy love and care.

Finally, O God, unite us all in an eternal purpose, to preserve and bear aloft the torch of freedom and peace among nations who love Thee and keep Thy commandments. To Thy honor and glory we offer this prayer. Amen.